

Dec 19 1926

THE
South Atlantic Quarterly

WILLIAM K. BOYD,
WILLIAM H. WANNAMAKER, } EDITORS

Volume XXV

DURHAM, NORTH CAROLINA

1926

NEW
PUBL.

299462A

THE NEW YORK
PUBLIC LIBRARY

299462A

ASTOR, LENOX AND
TILDEN FOUNDATIONS

R 1927 L

W 11
1914

Contents of Volume XXV

NUMBER 1, JANUARY 1926

Anti-Prohibition Hallucinations.....	<i>Albert Levitt</i>	1
The South Carolina Dispensary.....	<i>Francis B. Simkins</i>	13
William Blake and the Century Test	<i>Ola Elizabeth Winslow</i>	25
The Genesis of Henry Clay's American System	<i>E. Merton Coulter</i>	45
Andrew Johnson and the South.....	<i>Curtis Nettels</i>	55
What is an Artist?.....	<i>Lewis Worthington Smith</i>	65
Alexander Sergeyevich Pushkin.....	<i>Clarence A. Manning</i>	76
Book Reviews		89

NUMBER 2, APRIL 1926

Business or Politics: Which is the More Ethical?	<i>Clinton Rogers Woodruff</i>	107
Two Dangers Threatening the Federal Reserve System	<i>Raymond H. Lounsbury,</i> <i>Clyde Olin Fisher</i>	118
Alfred Tennyson: A Victorian Romance	<i>Charles Kassel</i>	139
The Criminality of Jean Paul Marat	<i>Louis R. Gottschalk</i>	154
Arthur Hugh Clough as Revealed in His Prose	<i>J. M. Beatty, Jr.</i>	168
The Charleston Commercial Convention of 1854	<i>J. H. Easterby</i>	181
Book Reviews		198

NUMBER 3, JULY 1926

The Challenge to Training in Politics	<i>Edward James Woodhouse</i>	223
Is the American Negro to Remain Black or Become Bleached?.....	<i>Kelly Miller</i>	240
Ambrose Bierce: The Gray Wolf of American Letters	<i>Leroy J. Nations</i>	253
The Burning of Columbia Reconsidered	<i>James D. Hill</i>	269
Chaucer and Oral Reading.....	<i>George P. Wilson</i>	283
The Farmers' Alliance in Florida	<i>James O. Knauss</i>	300
The Silent Novelists.....	<i>Robert Withington</i>	316
Book Reviews		322


NUMBER 4, OCTOBER 1926

Lawlessness as the American Classical Tradition	
<i>James M. Holzman</i>	343
A French Forecast of American Literature	
<i>Katherine Harrison</i>	350
Historical Predictions.....	<i>Charles O. Paulin</i>361
Anatole France's Recipe.....	<i>Frances A. Waterhouse</i>370
Human Traits in Quadruped Actors	
<i>Thornton S. Graves</i>	383
The Racial Bar Sinister in American Romance	
<i>Francis P. Gaines</i>	396
Who Reads William James?.....	<i>Charles H. Compton</i>403
The Proposal to Reopen the African Slave Trade	
in the South, 1854-1860.....	<i>W. J. Carnathan</i>410
Book Reviews	430

The
South Atlantic Quarterly

Anti-Prohibition Hallucinations

ALBERT LEVITT
Lexington, Va.



When the Eighteenth Amendment was adopted the anti-prohibition forces received a decisive defeat. The enactment of the Volstead Act turned the defeat into a rout. Since then most of them have admitted their defeat, acknowledged that the repeal of the Eighteenth Amendment was inconceivable and that it would take a political revolution even to modify the Volstead Act. A few, however, have insisted on fighting a desperate rearguard action. They have grown bitter in their defeat. They preach anarchy. They urge us to ignore the laws, to wink at their violation and to impede, by active resistance, their enforcement. Their propaganda is continuous. They are ready to go to any length to spread their ideas. Their publications are voluminous. In them are commingled insufficient historical instances with over-abundance of logical fallacies, an antiquated individualism with a pseudo-legal philosophy, a naive misconception of the privileges to be granted to political minorities, and anarchical ideas the adoption of which would make social progress exceedingly difficult and coherent government impossible. Four main ideas run through all their propaganda. These are (1) that the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act are improperly and illegally upon our statute books; (2) that Prohibition is so contrary to the customs and habits of the American people that it is an unnatural phenomenon and a legal monstrosity; (3) that Prohibition cannot exist with us forever and pending its disappearance we should act as though it had already vanished; and (4) that political minorities have rights which ought to be respected and allowed no matter how inimical to society these minorities may be. Such ideas may well be dubbed hallucinations.

I

The Anti-Prohibitionists profess to believe that the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act were illegally placed upon the statute books; that they were enacted without having been submitted to the people in proper fashion; that Prohibition is a radical and revolutionary change in policy; that the change was made as a war measure and at a time when the people were occupied with other things of a graver nature, so that a few fanatics and zealots were able to foist an undesirable situation upon an unsuspecting and preoccupied nation.

A belief such as this is arrant nonsense. The Eighteenth Amendment was submitted to the people of the nation in the only way in which a constitutional amendment *can* be submitted to them. It was submitted to the legislatures of the several states. They are elected by the people and, presumably, they represent the people. When the legislatures ratified the Eighteenth Amendment the people ratified it. The Volstead Act was passed by Congress. Congress represents the people in national affairs. Under our present system of government we have no way of referring national legislation directly to the individual voters. They act through their representatives. When the representatives passed the Prohibition Act the people passed it. If the opponents of Prohibition have a thesis to urge in favor of a pure democracy that is their concern. But what sense is there in saying that a thing was *not* done when it *was done* in the only way in which it *could have* been done under existing circumstances? They might just as sensibly argue that Columbus did not discover the Island of San Salvador because he did not cross the Atlantic in an aeroplane.

It is not true that the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act were war measures. A glance at the dates when the several legislatures ratified the Amendment and the National Prohibition Act was passed proves this.

The Amendment was submitted to the people on December 17, 1917. The Armistice came on November 11, 1918. On this latter date, for practical purposes the war was over. Whatever graver matters than prohibition were in the minds of the people, they did not include the war. Prior to the Armistice fourteen

states had ratified the Amendment. After the Armistice thirty-one states ratified it. Among these thirty-one were the most densely populated states in the Union, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, Ohio, California, Michigan and Minnesota. And the National Prohibition Act was not passed until October 28, 1919, or *nearly a year after the Armistice*. The opponents of prohibition are confusing the "War Prohibition Act" and the National Prohibition Act. The former was emergency, wartime legislation. The latter was the enactment of a peacetime policy. The National Prohibition Act makes this clear when it states that

"The term 'War Prohibition Act' used in this Act shall mean the provisions of any Act or Acts prohibiting the sale and manufacture of intoxicating liquors until the conclusion of the present war and thereafter until the termination of demobilization, the date of which shall be determined and proclaimed by the President of the United States."

If these two acts are not being confused, then is "confusion worse confounded" by deliberate misrepresentation. The people of the nation *did* ratify the Eighteenth Amendment and they did not pass the Volstead Act as a wartime measure.

II

It is contended, by opponents of Prohibition, that Prohibition is so contrary to the customs and habits of the American people that it is an unnatural phenomenon and a legal monstrosity. Recently one of their ablest spokesman has put their case thus:

"Most laws grow out of the habits and customs of the people. These habits grow into mores and are finally embodied in laws. Long before statutes are passed the great mass of men have formed their attitudes and ways of living and the statutes are simply codifications of existing folkways. Now and then, however, this natural process is changed. Some active minority, moved by religious zeal, political intolerance or special interest, finds itself able to pass a law that has not originated in the customs and habits of the people. Such laws are often extremely arrogant and oppressive; they violate the conscience, the practice and the beliefs, of a large number of the citizens of the state."¹

And he evidently wishes us to draw the inference that prohibition is the result of an unnatural process and is contrary to the customs and mores of the American people. But the inference he wishes us to draw is a *non sequitur*.

¹ Clarence Darrow, "Ordeal of Prohibition," *American Mercury*, Aug. 1924.

The ratification of the Eighteenth Amendment and the passage of the Prohibition Act establish a *prima facie* case that Prohibition is in accord with the customs, and therefore of the wishes, of a majority of the people of the nation. If this legislation has not been submitted to the people, as the anti-prohibitionists assert, then they have no authoritative information as to what the wishes of the people are. At most they can but guess at them. They are special pleaders. And it is an axiom of the law that the guess of a special pleader has no force against a *prima facie* case. Furthermore, what an active minority can do, an active majority can undo. Assuming, with the anti-prohibitionists, for the sake of the argument, that the Prohibition forces were the active minority it follows that the anti-prohibition forces are the majority. And they surely are active. Not for a moment have they let up the fight on the Volstead Act since its passage. Being the majority they should find it a simple matter to modify the Volstead Act and repeal the Amendment. No minority, however active, can frustrate an active majority. If the anti-prohibition forces represent the majority of the people of the nation they could have wiped the Volstead Act off the statute books last year, and can repeal the Eighteenth Amendment this coming year. But the truth of the matter is that the anti-prohibitionists do not represent the majority view. Nor do the prohibitionists. Both are militant minorities. But the prohibitionists have the passive majority with *them*. The majority would rather keep the evils and costs of Prohibition than return once more to the *greater* costs and evils of non-Prohibition. The majority will not fight even for its own good. But it recognizes and calmly appropriates to itself the best that the fighting minorities produce. That is why prohibition is here to stay.

The "natural process" in the evolution of a statute is not from customs through *mores* to statutory enactment. Not one per cent of the laws upon our books are "simply codifications of existing folkways." Statutes are not fossilized folkways. They do not conform to the past but shape the future. They are not the creatures of past customs but the creators of future conduct. They are not static expressions of what was, but dynamic aspira-

tions toward what is to be. They are the hopes of a present minority, which a future majority will realize.

Illustrations to support this thesis are endless. Our city ordinances furnish many. Tenement house legislation did not come about because it was the custom of the persons who lived in them to live in large, well-ventilated rooms; nor because it was the custom of those who built the tenements for profit to consider the welfare of the tenants. Fire ordinances prohibiting the placing of slop-jars, household utensils, furniture and bedding upon fire-escape landings did not grow out of the custom of the people to keep the fire-escapes clear of all things which would interfere with their proper use in times of danger. Health regulations prohibiting the throwing of garbage into the streets did not grow out of the custom of the people to dispose of waste matter in hygienic fashion. Compulsory school laws did not come because it was the custom of people to send all their children to school. Child labor ordinances did not grow out of the custom of the employers not to employ little children nor out of the custom of parents not to put their children to work during their infancy.

Or turn to state activities. Inspection and regulation of dairies did not come because it was the custom of farmers to keep their cows clean, their stables wholesome and the milk they were selling fit for human consumption. The regulation of weights and measures did not grow out of the custom of tradesmen to deal fairly and honestly with their customers. Welfare legislation, like compulsory insurance of employees, the eight-hour day, rest rooms for women, decent toilet facilities for employees, etc., etc., did not grow out of the custom of employers to regard their employees as human beings and to deal with them in a manner consistent with the general welfare.

In Federal legislation things are nowise different. The Civil Service laws were not passed because it was the custom of those in authority to appoint men to public office who were fit to perform the duties of the office, nor because of the custom that men were kept in office during good behaviour and continued efficiency. The Pure Food laws did not grow out of the custom of merchants who sold only unadulterated, properly and

honestly labelled, and non-deleterious foods and drugs. The laws governing the awarding of government contracts are not the development of a custom among builders and contractors to deal fairly and honestly with the government. The laws protecting Indians are not the outcome of a custom among white men of dealing fairly with the red men. The Interstate Commerce Commission was not created because there was a custom on the part of the railroads of charging only reasonable rates. The Bankruptcy Act was not passed because it was a custom among insolvent business men to deal honestly with their creditors, nor because there was a custom among creditors to deal humanely with their debtors.

These, and similar statutes were placed upon the books because it was the custom of the majority to do what is now forbidden by the statutes. The statutes forbade the customs. The pre-existing customs were found to be detrimental to the general welfare of the community, the state, the nation. The statute was the beginning of an attempt on the part of organized society to change and modify the customs. Customs are the result of majority inertia. Statutes are the outcome of minority vigor. Statutes emerge from strife between groups and not from unanimity of a majority.

The achievement of woman suffrage is an excellent example of the growth of a statute and its effect in our own day. About seventy-five years ago three women were utterly convinced that women should have the right to vote. In a little while they convinced a few others that they were right. They held a convention. They were ridiculed, derided, scorned. The state was against them. The press held them up to scorn. The church damned them. Some pulpитеers proved by chapter and verse that to allow women to vote would be indecent, immoral, irreligious, subversive of home, the family, honor, chastity, and would lead to the coming of Anti-Christ. But the little band of women persevered. The movement spread. A minority group sprang up here and there. Some states finally allowed women to vote. The opposition grew bitter. Most men were opposed. Most women were apathetic. Some women became violent opponents. But the movement grew somewhat. Then a consti-

tutional amendment was introduced in Congress. For years the proponents of the amendment tried to get unanimity of action in their own ranks as to methods of procedure. They believed in sweetness and light, in gentle persuasion, in ladylike behavior. Good form was a jewel above all price. And they got licked. Then along came Alice Paul. And with her came Elsie Hill, and Doris Stevens and Lucy Burns. They urged more militant tactics. The Gentle Ladies demurred. The Militants insisted. Inter-tribal strife began. The Militants withdrew from the older organization. They began direct action. They ignored the Gentle Ladies. They whipped their men opponents. They routed their women opponents. The World War came. We joined the fray. The country said "Forget everything else; win the war; make the world safe for democracy." The Militants replied: "Democracy begins at home! Votes for women!" They began to picket. They picketted the House, the Senate, the President. The police were sent against them. They were reviled, beaten, starved, maltreated and imprisoned. But they kept on. They whipped the police, intimidated Congress and harassed the President. At last the latter surrendered. He gave the word. Congress passed the Susan B. Anthony Amendment. The states ratified it. And then statutes enabling women to vote were placed upon the statute books. There was no "custom" of allowing women to vote; no "mores" of allowing women to vote; no "simple codification of existing folkways." A militant minority fought. The President cracked the whip. The puppets in the House and Senate danced. The lesser puppets throughout the land followed their leaders. And now women may vote. In less dramatic fashion this is the history of nearly all of the important statutes which our legislatures enact.

III

The opponents of Prohibition agree that Prohibition is here to stay for some time at least. But they insist that Prohibition cannot remain in force forever; that "millions of people who have no sense of wrong in making, selling or using intoxicating liquors" cannot be "subject for all time to drastic penalties and tyrannical judgment;" that it must disappear; that the proper

thing for us to do *now* is to ignore the law and act as though it was already non-existent.

Well, "all time" is a long, long time. It is hardly likely that any human institution can exist through all Eternity. Human life is mutable. Nations rise and fall. Constitutions are made and unmade. There are no unchanging principles of right and wrong. Political revolutions do occur. The United States is here. The inconceivable happens. We have the radio, the airplane and the submarine. No doubt the Eighteenth Amendment will go the way of the Code of Hammurabi, the Institutes of Justinian and the Laws of Alfred. "Our little systems have their day; they have their day and cease to be." But what of it? What has the ephemeral character of human experience to do with the anti-prohibitionist's thesis that the Eighteenth Amendment, *so long as it is in existence*, should be persistently and deliberately violated? They purport to answer this question "by a glance at the history of the methods by which laws have been made and repealed in the past." Let us glance with them! Out of the maelstrom of the history of civilization they usually fasten their gaze upon instances of religious persecution or segments of the criminal law of England and the United States. They point to the fact that the devotees of the Bacchus Cult in Ancient Rome were forbidden to meet together or to worship according to their rites and were bitterly persecuted yet refused to obey these laws and survived; that the Jews have been legislated against and persecuted for countless generations, and still maintain their position with extraordinary tenacity and power; that the early Christians were legislated against, refused to obey the laws, were massacred in horrible fashion and yet won over their persecutors and nearly all of Europe to at least a nominal adherence to Christianity. We grant that this historical data is truthfully presented. But, what of it? These instances show that religious persecutions are doomed to failure. Spiritual ideals and religious aspirations cannot be destroyed by dungeon, fire or sword. The history of the Inquisition tells the same story. The Catholic Church has always failed in its attempts to stifle intellectual freedom and spiritual emancipation. Evolution does go on in spite of the Fundamentalists of all ages. But

what has this to do with resistance to the Eighteenth Amendment? Since when have bootleggers become priests of religion? Since when have "hipflask toters" become prophets of a living faith for whose sake they are willing to lay down their lives? It is ludicrous to have the anti-prohibitionists say, (to quote from one of their ardent supporters) that:

"The repeated attempts of part of a community to control the beliefs, the conduct and the habits of men who have an instinctive feeling that they were right, and the utter failure of all such attempts gave birth to the aphorism 'the blood of the martyrs is the seed of the church'."¹

Are the violaters of the Volstead Act martyrs? Is the Temple of Booze a church? The language just quoted is without meaning or sense. You can't put Fox's "Book of Martyrs" into a whiskey bottle. The Eighteenth Amendment interferes with no man's religion. The Volstead Act expressly excludes sacramental wine from the scope of its provisions. Obedience to them will keep no man from worshipping God in his own way. That religious persecutions must fail is true. The assertion that the enforcement of Prohibition is a religious persecution is utterly false.

The anti-prohibitionists appeal to the criminal law to support their position. They point to the fact that for many years the poor laws and the trade union laws of England were persistently violated until the authorities found themselves impotent to enforce them and the laws become dead letters upon the statute books. They cite many sections of the Criminal Code of England which prescribed the death penalty for offenses which the people insistently and persistently committed until juries failed to convict and the laws fell into disuse. They show that the prohibition of loitering, loafing, poaching, petty larceny and the formation of labor unions was unsuccessful because the people paid no attention to the prohibitions and at last the penal code had to be changed to conform to the desires of the people. They state that "the humanizing of the English penal code came from the fact that juries would not convict. They were too humane and decent to obey the laws." They urge upon us the same

¹ See note 1.

course of conduct. They counsel us to disobey the prohibition laws until they too become dead letters.

But the anti-prohibitionists are dealing in half-truths. It is true that time and again, in the history of English criminal law, juries failed to convict those who were brought before them. But the reason why the juries would not convict was because the *punishments they had to impose were too severe*. Hanging a man because he refused to work, or poached on a nobleman's preserves, or stole a loaf of bread, shocked their sense of justice. But these offenses were not approved of or condoned. As soon as the punishments were modified convictions were had once more. The activities we have indicated are criminal offenses now in England, *now* just as they were in by-gone days. The punishments differ and that is all. And juries convict. The instances cited help to prove that over-severe penalties lead juries to acquit offenders. They do not prove the thesis that the way to repeal a law is to violate it.

The anti-labor laws formerly in force in England belong to a totally different category. They represent economic oppression, the attempt of the employer group to subjugate the workers. Economic oppression always fails, in the long run. One of the means of frustrating it is the organizing of labor. That is why trade unionism has always persisted in spite of drastic legislation, drives against the I. W. W., and Daugherty injunctions. But the Eighteenth Amendment is not an outcome of economic oppression. It is not group legislation. It applies to all classes alike. Neither employers nor employees can claim special privileges under it. So that even if we admitted, which we do not, that laborers have the right to organize in defiance of the law, to maintain their economic integrity, this would not prove that the Volstead Act which has nothing to do with the economic integrity of the working classes, should be violated and flouted.

IV

The anti-prohibitionists are fond of making eloquent pleas for the toleration minorities. One of their recent protagonists has said:

"It is a popular idea that the majority should rule. But this does not mean that the people should vote on every question affecting human life, and that the majority should then pass penal statutes to make the rest conform. No society can hold together that does not have a broad toleration for minorities. To enforce the obedience of minorities by criminal statutes because a mere majority is found to have certain views is tyranny and must result in endless disorder and suffering."

This, like most generalizations, sounds like something and means nothing. The writer of the above quotation surely cannot mean that *every* minority should be tolerated. A dozen men band themselves together to rob mail-trains. They are a minority. Are they to be tolerated? A group of men form a corporation for the exploitation of oil-wells in Mexico. They go there, bribe the officials, violate the laws, get into trouble, foment strife, evoke international complications and bring nations to the verge of war. They are a minority. Should they be tolerated? A mob breaks into a prison where an accused is awaiting trial, overpowers the jailors, takes the accused and hangs him to the nearest tree. The Ku Klux Klan wants to make the world safe for none but native, protestant whites. "A little house on K Street" harbors a group of individuals who barter official power and place for personal, nefarious ends. A group in Michigan combine to buy one of their number a seat in the United States Senate. Another group engages in the transportation of women for immoral ends. A third smuggles opium. A fourth sells morphine, cocaine and heroin to drug addicts. These are all minorities in action. Are they all to be tolerated? Yet all these activities are forbidden by laws. Are these laws to be habitually violated? Are all laws to be violated simply because minorities will suffer because of their enforcement? If not, which laws are to be violated? Who is to decide the matter? The minority which wishes to violate them? The passive majority which stupidly yields to whichever minority happens to have the upper hand at a given time? Is it to be every man for himself? To ask these questions is to answer them. In every politically organized society there must be some final arbiter of conflicts. Minorities cannot be permitted to battle each other interminably. The general welfare demands

¹ See note 1.

that controversies be settled at some time in the best possible way under the then existing circumstances. Under our system of government a political controversy is settled when the several state legislatures ratify a constitutional amendment growing out of that controversy and an enabling statute is passed. Thereafter nothing can honorably be done except obey the law, or repeal the statute, or re-amend the Constitution. That is why Mr. Chief Justice Taft, who was a staunch opponent of Prohibition, now insists upon it that the Eighteenth Amendment and the Volstead Act must be enforced and obeyed. There is nothing else for a decent man to do. For a long time I was an honest foe of Prohibition. I fought as valiantly as I could for the cause in which I believed. That cause is lost. I was legally defeated. I cannot now honestly and decently try to get by illegal means that which I cannot obtain legally. I cannot urge others to disobey the law and hinder its enforcement. If I did I should be like the base-ball player who, having been struck out, throws his bat at the umpire and incites the bleachers to riot.

The South Carolina Dispensary

FRANCIS B. SIMKINS
Emory University

In 1885 Ben Tillman, the most notable figure in recent South Carolina history, emerged from the obscurity of twenty years as a hard-working farmer into the position of the foremost political agitator of that state. Because he was possessed of a moderate education, a mind capable of arriving at generalizations concerning the sectional and class interests of his state, the ability to project constructive reforms and the willingness to devote his whole energy towards the achievement of these reforms, and because he cherished personal resentments against the ruling element in the state and was possessed of a caustic tongue and pen, he was able to make himself Governor of South Carolina in 1890 and its political dictator by 1893.

Most unique among the several constructive political reforms which he put into operation was the institution with which this paper is concerned, namely, the so-called State Dispensary System, through which the government of South Carolina undertook to monopolize the sale of strong drink.

This system was instituted in the face of the gradually achieved conviction on the part of the majority of the people of the state in favor of the absolute prohibition of the liquor traffic. The efforts towards the control of this traffic began in 1740 with an act prohibiting the sale of intoxicants to slaves except on the request of their masters.¹ This was followed in 1801 by the imposition of a special license tax on spirits.² The growth of the prohibition sentiment in the decade before the Civil War is evidenced by the agitations of so prominent a jurist as Belton O'Neill and notable leaders in the evangelical churches. In fact, in 1854 prohibition was effected in a township of Abbeville district.³ The growth of this sentiment after 1865 resulted in the prohibition of the sale of intoxicants in rural districts in 1880; the enactment, in 1882, of an easy method through which communities might establish prohibi-

¹ *Acts of South Carolina*, 1740, No. 670.

² *Ibid.*, 1801, No. 1762.

³ *Ibid.*, 1854, No. 30.

tion;⁴ the temporary adoption of this system by Barnwell and Oconee counties in 1883, and its permanent adoption by Marlboro and Williamsburg counties and seventy-six small communities by 1891.⁵ The Prohibitionists had become so strong that in the latter year they were able to force through the House of Representatives a bill providing for state-wide prohibition. But this proposal was rejected by the more conservative Senate. The next achievement of the reformers was the inducement of the state Democratic authorities to place a separate box at each polling place in the primary election of 1892, in which the people were allowed to express their opinion on the question of state-wide prohibition. The people expressed themselves by a great majority in favor of the proposal.

Armed with the popular mandate for their object and with a clear majority in both houses of the legislature, the Prohibitionists introduced, early in the legislature of 1892, a most stringent prohibition bill. In spite of the opposition of the experienced parliamentarians of the cities it passed the House after a lengthy discussion. For eight long days the Senate floundered over it. Then, without any previous warning of his intent, John Gary Evans, the Tillman leader of the Senate, informed the two houses that Governor Tillman desired the passage of the unknown Dispensary Law as a substitute for the prohibition bill.⁶

The manner in which Tillman had become convinced of the wisdom of an act so at variance with the traditional individualism of South Carolina is most interesting. In 1865, and afterwards, certain Swedish cities had adopted the so-called Gothenburg system of municipal monopoly of the sale of strong drink. In 1885, in order to meet the special problems of a college town, Athens, Georgia, had adopted with success a modified form of this institution. Living in South Carolina in 1892, as confidant of Tillman and as editor of the latter's organ, was a certain Larry Gantt, who had previously lived in Athens, where he had become a convert to that town's method of dealing with the liquor traffic. Tillman, although in principle a well-known

⁴ *Ibid.*, 1881-1882, pp.893-895; 1880, No. 374.

⁵ *Ibid.*, *passim*, 1883-1891.

⁶ *News and Courier* (Charleston) and *The State* (Columbia), Dec. 22-25, 1892.

opponent of prohibition, had, previous to the opening of the legislature of 1892, tactfully avoided taking a part in the liquor controversy. However, Gantt had already convinced him of the benefits of the Athens plan. It would give the state, Gantt said,⁷ an abundance of revenue and thereby afford Tillman an easy means through which to keep his pledge to reduce taxes; by decreasing the consumption of strong drink, it would be a wise compromise between the prohibition and saloon factions. Tillman expressed his conviction in favor of Gantt's argument by advocating the Athens plan in general terms in his first message to the legislature of that year, and by his determination to force it into law at the end of the session.

The manner in which the law was passed is an interesting commentary on his ability to enforce obedience to his will. Opposed to his intention was the sentiment of a majority of both the people and the legislature—which included both the advocates of prohibition and the saloons. In addition, the legislature, which had already decided, after a tedious debate, to enact prohibition, was incapable of understanding this very strange piece of new legislation in the short time given for its consideration, and was not desirous of doing the will of the high-handed Governor for whom it had no personal love. But Tillman was able to effect his wish because of his hold upon the popular imagination, and because a majority of the legislature, who owed their positions to him, feared that he might order their defeat in the next election. Operating from his office in "the lower regions of the State House," he, through personal admonitions administered individually in the strongest of language, forced the more recalcitrant of his partisans to support the bill. The result was that when the legislature adjourned on Christmas Eve the Dispensary System was a part of the law of South Carolina.⁸

The Dispensary Act⁹ gave the state the monopoly of the liquor traffic. A State Board of Control, composed of the Governor and two other state officials, was given the super-

⁷ *Columbia Daily Register*, Nov. 30, 1892.

⁸ *News and Courier* and *The State*, Dec. 21-26, 1892, contain full accounts of the manner in which the law was enacted.

⁹ *Acts of South Carolina*, 1892, pp. 61-67; 1893, pp. 430-450.

vision of the institution, and a Dispensary Commissioner was given active control. In each county in which one or more dispensaries were to be established, a county board of control was constituted which should have authority to appoint the dispensers and their assistants. To be eligible for the position of dispenser one was forced to prove that he did not "drink" and was not likely by present or past occupation to be privately interested in the liquor business. The majority of the electors of any township could prevent the establishment of a dispensary in their midst. In a county which had previously prohibited the liquor traffic a petition of one-fourth of the citizens and a vote of the majority of the electors could effect the establishment of a branch of the institution. Persons desirous of purchasing liquors were required to file an application with the dispenser stating the quantity and kind of liquor desired. If the applicant was intoxicated, or given to using liquor in excess, his application was to be rejected. The liquors had to be sold in sealed packages, not to be opened on the premises. Constables appointed by the Governor in numbers which he deemed sufficient were charged with the prevention of private sales. If the State Board of Control deemed a municipality derelict in the enforcement of the prohibition against private sales, it could withdraw the municipality's share of the dispensary earnings. The profits of retail sales were to be evenly divided between counties and municipalities, while those accruing from the state's handling of the liquors were to go to the state treasury. The act went into effect July 1, 1893.

The Governor, in his effort to put into operation such an unprecedented act of state socialism, met with the most determined opposition. The individualistic people of South Carolina had overnight been served notice that they must drink under regulation and give into the public treasury profits which had previously gone to private individuals. The *Columbia State*, a newspaper which had in the previous year been founded to combat Tillman, immediately began its fourteen-year task of doing the institution to death. The *News and Courier*¹⁰ predicted that such a radical act of legislation would never go into

¹⁰ Jan. 24, 1893.

effect, while the municipal authorities of Charleston and several other towns issued licenses to saloons to operate six months after the date the law required that they should be closed. A convention of nine hundred bar owners pledged themselves to do all in their power to defeat the law,¹¹ while the most influential of the prohibition organs¹² called it "a just cause for lamentation," and a Baptist congregation expelled from its membership the man whom Tillman appointed Dispensary Commissioner.¹³ The difficulties of the Governor were increased by the fact that the inhabitants of the towns, in which the dispensaries only could be established by provision of the law, had always been hostile to him and anything he had advocated.

But Tillman, with the energy and coolness characteristic of his previous career, boldly went about the task of putting his law into operation. "The bar-rooms of the state," he said, "will be closed after July 1, and the law will be enforced to the limit." He appointed a thorough business man, who was the husband of a prominent official of the W. C. T. U., as Dispensary Commissioner. Desiring to use to the best advantage the meager \$50,000 which the legislature had appropriated for the purchase of the initial stock of liquors, he journeyed to Louisville and Cincinnati to supervise personally the purchases. Although himself a teetotaler, he demonstrated sufficient expert knowledge of the grades of liquors to accomplish his desire. "If I catch you monkeying with your agreements," he rudely told a distiller who had extended him credit, "I will quit you and wont buy a gallon." When he returned, under his personal supervision a building was provided with equipment for the bottling of the liquors as they were received.¹⁴ In the principal municipalities in which the law permitted the operation of the dispensaries, buildings were equipped with the fittings necessary for their opening. "There can be no doubt," admitted the *News and Courier*,¹⁵ "that everything about the

¹¹ *News and Courier*, Jan. 8, 1893.

¹² *Baptist Courier*, Jan. 4, 1893.

¹³ *News and Courier*, Oct. 24, 1893.

¹⁴ From Tillman's testimony before a legislative committee appointed in 1906 to investigate the Dispensary—*Reports and Resolutions of the General Assembly of South Carolina*, 1906, III, 304-12.

¹⁵ July 16, 1893.

Dispensary is done in the most improved and businesslike manner." As the date for the opening approached, Tillman gathered around himself the badges and arms necessary for the use of the constables whom he might find necessary to dispatch to any place in which the law might not work smoothly. "I will make the places that won't accept the Dispensary," he said,¹⁶ "dry enough to burn. I will send special constables if I have to cover every city block with a separate man." The result was that the dispensaries opened on schedule.

But trouble soon grew out of the activities of the constables whom the Governor used to prevent private traffic in liquors. The newspapers educated the people to resist searches of their dwellings. "The spies," as the constables were called, were pictured as "monsters," and casualties committed in their efforts to enforce the law, as "murders." "Our bloody Governor" was portrayed as presiding over stores of ammunition to be used against the defenders of the public liberties.¹⁷ "The people," said *The State*, "will know that if the Governor's armed spies enter their homes, insult their women and shoot down their sons or brothers, they will be promptly pardoned."¹⁸ "I'll be—," said even the brother of the Governor, "if I don't shoot the first spy who enters my residence and opens my package of goods."¹⁹ No wonder insurrection was brewing.

And insurrection came in less than a year after the law went into effect. As a result of the resentment growing out of the execution of some search warrants in the town of Darlington by a group of constables, a riot developed between the constables and a mob of citizens on March 30, 1894. In the interchange of shots two citizens and a constable were killed and several citizens wounded. When the constables fled before the mob, the enraged citizens, aided by other enemies of the Dispensary who had been summoned by bells and telegrams, began a man-hunt in the familiar style of the South.

¹⁶ *New York Sun*, July 9, 1893.

¹⁷ *The State*, Jan. 1, 1894.

¹⁸ Jan. 28, 1894.

¹⁹ *News and Courier*, Jan. 16, 1894.

At five o'clock of the same day the Governor and the people of Columbia received the news of what was happening. The former, faced with the duty of preventing the possible lynching of the agents of the law, acted promptly. He ordered the three militia companies of the city to move to Darlington by special train. In the meantime the people of the city, already hostile to the Governor and to the Dispensary, were stirred to fury by the inflammatory bulletins of *The State*. The companies, intimidated by the threats of the populace, and acting on the advice of such an important citizen as the Episcopal Bishop of South Carolina, refused to obey the call of the Governor. This was followed by the receipt of the news that the militia of the other towns, who had been ordered to board the special train, had likewise refused to obey the call. The General of the Charleston militia telegraphed the Governor: "My command will not lend itself to foster civil war among our brethren."

Having failed in his efforts to exact obedience from the organized militia, the Governor ordered the mobilization of the unorganized militia of the rural districts, from whom he drew his political strength. In spite of the threats of angry crowds who swore that no companies should go to Darlington, he was able by the morning of the second day after the initial disturbances to concentrate 475 of his "wool-hat" militia in the state prison, and he was able to place a guard of the command of which he had been captain as the protector of the Governor's Mansion against the threats of the mob. These events were followed by the threat of a mob led by J. C. Haskell, a bitter enemy of Tillman, to storm the prison and the declaration by the Governor that the counties of Darlington and Florence were "in open rebellion." Three days after the disobedience of the regular militia, a regiment of the improvised militia moved to Darlington, only to find their presence unnecessary, as the town had become quiet and the constables had escaped without injury to themselves.

The Governor dealt firmly with the disobedient militia. The officers were dismissed, the rank and file disarmed, and in their place a hundred rural companies were organized. The "costly

farce" of a court martial was not attempted as the punishment of so large and so influential an element of the state's population was obviously impossible.²⁰

The "Dispensary War" threw in sharp relief the bitter antagonisms which divided the people of South Carolina over the Dispensary. Conservative men had attempted to lynch the agents of their government and the militia had mutinied. The Governor had shown himself determined to enforce the hated law to the extent of violating individual liberties and supporting constables who fired into crowds. Yet he had won a victory for the supremacy of law and the enforcement of the Dispensary System. He lost none of his popularity among the rural masses of the state, and the press outside the state, hitherto hostile to him, applauded his firm stand. Said the *London Spectator*:²¹ "The rebellion seems to be over, thanks to the prompt action of Governor Tillman. . . . He has grit."

No less troublesome than the popular hostility which Tillman encountered was the hostility of the courts to his law. At the time of the Darlington Riot a circuit judge had already enjoined the county board of control of that county from operating a dispensary, basing his action on the belief that a state monopoly for trade was unconstitutional. However, the newly-elected Tillman member of the State Supreme Court suspended the injunction pending a decision from the full court. Less than three weeks after the Darlington Riot—at a time when the Dispensary was in greatest disrepute—the Supreme Court by a vote of two anti-Tillman partisans to one Tillman partisan declared the law unconstitutional.²² Tillman was forced to obey. Four days after the decision he ordered the dispensaries closed. As the court had only declared those portions of the law unconstitutional which permitted the state to engage in the liquor traffic, the sections prohibiting private sales remained in force. The state now had a prohibition law, although no attempt was made to enforce it.²³

²⁰ For these events I have used *The Register, The State and the News and Courier*, March 29-April 15, 1894; Tillman MS., "The Darlington Riot;" "Message of 1894," *Senate Journal*, 1894, pp. 18-40.

²¹ May 16, 1894.

²² *McCullough v. Brown*, 41 S. C., 220.

²³ As proven by the fact that the national government between April 21 and August 1, 1894, issued 1174 liquor licenses for South Carolina.

But Tillman had anticipated the action of the court. He had used his influence with the legislature of 1893 to effect the defeat of Justice McGowan and the election in his place of Eugene B. Gary, a Tillman partisan, and to effect the passage of a new Dispensary Act to take the place of the one the court had under review. This did not prevent the hostile decision of the court, as McGowan's term of office did not expire until the following August, but it did make certain that after that date the new law could be put in force and a decision favorable to it could be exacted from a court now two to one in Tillman's favor. Accordingly, on August 1, 1894, the Dispensary Act of 1893 was declared in force. This was followed by a decision, written by Justice Gary, declaring that the Dispensary was constitutional because a public monopoly was a legitimate part of the police power of the state.²⁴ Tillman in explaining his conduct frankly admitted that "the same general principle underlay both acts, and that if one was unconstitutional the other was also. . . . [But] a change in the courts made me feel it my duty to revise the Act of 1892."²⁵

Tillman was able to leave office in 1894 with the Dispensary triumphant over the wrath of the people and the courts.²⁶

Before considering the movement which led to the abolition of the Dispensary, we shall consider to what extent it accomplished the two objects for which it was created—the increase of the public revenue and the decrease of the amount of strong drinks consumed.

During the fourteen-year period of its existence the average annual profit derived by the state from the liquor business was \$465,600,²⁷ which was double the amount which the state had previously derived from the sale of liquor licenses. This increased revenue was more evenly distributed over the state than had been the case previously, and the state government which previously had received no portion of the liquor revenue now got its share. A government pledged to the reduction of taxation was able to meet more adequately the demands of a progressive

²⁴ *State vs. Aiken*, 42 S. C., 222.

²⁵ *Senate Journal*, 1894, pp. 31, 33.

²⁶ In 1897 the United States Supreme Court declared the law constitutional. *Vance vs. Vandercock*, 170, U. S. 438.

²⁷ A computation from the reports of the Dispensary commissions.

South, especially the demands for education, as a portion of the liquor revenue after 1900 was used for this purpose.

In spite of the substantial increase in revenue there can be no doubt that the revenue would have been greater had no corruption and inefficiency crept into the administration of the institution. The Dispensary was born in a welter of politics, and it was but natural that the successors of the man who had emphasized the importance of popular elections as a means of electing public servants should have been inefficient or even dishonest politicians. In addition, South Carolina had no tradition of an expert bureaucracy, the means through which European communities have been able to operate successfully ventures in state socialism. The result was that when the South Carolina politician was given, for the first time, the opportunity to deal in business on a large scale many irregularities crept in. In 1906 a legislative investigation committee discovered that rebates had been paid by agents of liquor wholesale houses to agents of the South Carolina institution. "It required something more than good liquor to get the business," said a whiskey merchant.²⁸ Irresponsible clerks bought more whiskey than was necessary.²⁹ When the affairs of the Dispensary were settled in 1910, many distillers were forced to pay fines to the state as a compensation for irregularities. These and numerous other instances of corruption and inefficiency led a commission of the legislature to declare that the officials of the Dispensary "have become shameless in their abuse of power, insatiable in their greed, and perfidious in the discharge of their oath of office."³⁰

The establishment of the Dispensary tended to decrease the consumption of strong drink—to what degree I cannot state. The lure of the gilded bar, the charm of drinking on the place, and the other devices for attracting trade for the saloon were abolished, and in their place were substituted the unadorned dispensaries in which no loafing was allowed and from which liquors were sold only in sealed packages, ostensibly only to persons who did not use alcohol to excess. In 1892 there had

²⁸ *Reports and Resolutions*, 1906, III, 296.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 1910, III, 280.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 1910, III, 282.

been 613 bars in the state; there were never more than 146 dispensaries. In a two months' period of the first year in which the Dispensary was in operation the number of arrests for drunkenness, in eighteen towns, fell from 576, the record of the previous year, to 283.⁸¹ These figures should be taken as proof that the Dispensary under the vigorous administration of Tillman decreased the excessive consumption of strong drink.

That the law continued to hold in check the consumption of strong drinks is very doubtful. The regulations concerning to whom liquors might be sold were not kept. In spite of the continued activity of the constables, "blind tigers" and "clubs" for the sale of liquors continued to flourish in the towns with the backing of local opinion. A foreign observer reported the general standard of enforcement as low and told of "saloon-keepers who called themselves druggists and sold liquors to all comers for medicinal purposes."⁸²

The political campaign of 1906 centered around the movement for the abolition of the State Dispensary and the substitution in its place of county-controlled dispensaries in those counties which did not elect prohibition. Tillman, while expressing openly his aversion for the manner in which the Dispensary was then managed, used his great personal influence for the retention of the institution he had spent his best energy in creating. The fault, he said, was due to placing its administration into the hands of unfit politicians.⁸³ But his plea was in vain. The "local option" candidate was elected Governor, the Dispensary was abolished in 1907, and each county was given the right to vote whether it should have county dispensaries or absolute prohibition.⁸⁴ But in 1915 all the counties, with the exception of a few of those in which the larger towns were located, had elected prohibition. In that year the people of every county except Charleston voted by an overwhelming majority in favor of state-wide prohibition.⁸⁵

But the fact that South Carolina saw fit to abolish Governor Tillman's great idea is no proof that it was *per se* a failure.

⁸¹ Tillman, *North American Review*, Feb. 1894, p. 145.

⁸² E. L. Fanshawe, *Liquor Legislation in U. S.* (London, 1894), 356-357.

⁸³ Tillman to T. D. Jervy, Dec. 28, 1904.

⁸⁴ *Acts of South Carolina*, 1907, pp. 463-481.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 1915, pp. 88-90; *Reports and Resolutions*, 1916, pp. 715-716.

In spite of lax management, it was always profitable. Surely, had not outside influence worked against it, capable officials could have been found to manage an institution which involved the yearly handling of only \$2,500,000. The principal reason which led to its destruction was the reassertion of the dominant and growing prohibition sentiment, which only Tillman, in the height of his power, had been able to override with difficulty, a sentiment which existed independent of the Dispensary. The unfaltering energy of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union and the growing importance of the Methodist and Baptist clergy and the rural voters, whom Tillman had taught to exercise their power, spelled the triumph of stricter ideas of personal morality which left no room for the legalized sale of drink.

Although there is little possibility of the Dispensary's ever again being of more than historic interest in a state so thoroughly convinced of the wisdom of prohibition as South Carolina, this South Carolina experiment may well engage the attention of the active and influential minority of Americans who are opposed both to National Prohibition and to a return to the obnoxious saloon system. It stands as an institution which authorized the legalized sale of liquors with the possibility of the maximum of financial profit to the state, while at the same time ever tending to reduce the consumption of drinks to such moderate balance as might have eliminated the old American evil of drunkenness. It offers an excellent means through which a young nation, given to reckless extremes of either total abstinence or unreasonable excess, may arrive at the wise expediency of moderate indulgence without the pains of either absolute denial or over-indulgence—such a moderation as is associated with a mature civilization which understands the art of the full life.

William Blake and the Century Test

OLA ELIZABETH WINSLOW
Goucher College

"My heart is full of futurity," wrote William Blake,¹ not meaning to be a prophet. But prophet he was in those casual words, recalling as they do today a lifetime of laurels withheld, and a tardy coronation long after men had forgotten the location of the "common grave" in which they had laid him.²

But Blake's craving was so little for the "fame of mortality" that "futurity" as he spoke it may well suggest other thoughts than those of genius neglected, poignant as his own tragedy was. As the centenary of his death invites to fresh appraisal, we may well ask for what strange gospel he was rejected in his own day and what he has for us,

"Children of the future age,
Reading this indignant page."

The answer concerns in differing measure his religious views, his art theories, and his politics, for in each of these directions his own age branded him an absurd visionary.

As passing years have made his notions seem less radical, it has come to be the fashion to say that he was a man born out of due time and to regret the irony of his having fallen on such evil days,—for the dreamer,—as the commonsense, reasoning, denying eighteenth century. And yet, one may ask of those who blame his century for the cries of "Madman," would the nineteenth have lent him a more willing ear, or the twentieth, or the first? The truth is that in any but that golden age of his own rapt visionings, that era he sought to restore among men, William Blake would have been a vain babbler, a voice crying in solitary places, unheralded and unheeded.

It is not enough to say that he was ahead of his day. He was, leagues ahead, and still is, now that he has been dead al-

¹ Letter to Thomas Butts, Apr. 25, 1803. *The Letters of William Blake*, (Edited by A. G. B. Russell), London, 1906, p. 116.

² An unmarked grave shared with seven others in Bunhill Fields Cemetery. For an attempt to determine its location, see Herbert Jenkins, *Nineteenth Century*, LXX, Vol. 7, pp. 163-169.

³ *A Little Girl Lost*, (Oxford Edition, Edited by John Sampson), London, 1914, p. 103. Unless it is otherwise stated, references to the text of poems are to this edition.

most a century, and yet time alone will never wholly vindicate William Blake's so-called prophecies. His was not the loneliness of a man born too late or too soon, but the loneliness of all those who do their thinking in remote realms of the spirit. For Blake, like St. John of the Cross, St. Theresa, Jacob Boehme, and other mystics, stood curiously outside the world of men, touching actuality at only a few points, and speaking the language of his fellows but seldom. From childhood, solitude was his element, and his citizenship destined to be in worlds other than this,—a fact which he frequently recognized and accepted with utter naturalness. He once wrote, presumably of himself,

"The Angel that presided o'er my birth
Said 'Little creature, form'd of joy and mirth,
Go, love without the help of anything on earth'."⁴

Fitting commentary it proved for his whole life.

But even loneliness and poverty have their immunities, and regret as we may the very real hardships of Blake's life, circumstances were for the most part favorable to the instinct for detachment in which he found freedom of spirit.

"Great things are done when men and mountains meet;"

he wrote,

"This is not done by jostling in the street."⁵

He had his contacts with men and affairs, of course, and his life was by no means lacking in the spectacular incidents common to the troubled times through which he lived, and yet the picture of William Blake wearing the red cap in the streets of London, saving Tom Paine from the gallows by a timely warning, or himself suffering trial for treason, after all, does some violence to the spirit of his life. For Blake was first and last a solitary, and his life story yields little which marks him an active participant in the great upheavals of his day. If from his meagre personal annals a single detail were to be chosen as symbolic of his relation to the turbulent eighteenth century, it would scarcely be the wearing of the red cap. Far more typical would be one of those days when, as an engraver's apprentice,

⁴ *Gnomic Verses*, p. 198.

⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 193.

he sat high on a scaffold amid the silence and solemnity of Westminster Abbey, copying tombs and recumbent effigies of ancient kings and queens. In such places did Blake meet his mountains.

But in spite of absorption in worlds other than the actual, Blake did not escape the thought currents nor seek to evade the issues of his own day. Comments on men and institutions, protests against life as he found it, bulk fairly large in his work. However, those opinions which he shared with William Godwin, Mary Wollstonecraft, Tom Paine and other radicals would not of themselves constitute a sufficient foundation for everlasting remembrance, nor do they furnish an altogether safe clue to an understanding of his thought. There was something lesser about William Blake whenever he took off the sandals which enabled him to walk forward through eternity and pronounced on merely human affairs. The fact is, he was not at home in the work-a-day world. It was only when he saw reality under the guise of myth that his genius took fire and permitted him to speak with authority. For that reason it would be manifestly unfair, even if it were possible, to separate the easily intelligible pronouncements concerning republicanism, free love, ecclesiastical authority and the other timely subjects which engaged his pen, from the mystical doctrines and the elaborate scheme of mythology by which he sought to explain man and the universe. The two must be considered together if Blake's meaning is to be rightly interpreted and his stature measured in comparison with that of other thinkers of his own generation and of all time. For to call him a radical or a revolutionist (and he was both), is to call him less than he was. He did not think in terms of Parliaments, of despots, and of 1776. He could not have been a revolutionist on such terms. To him the Revolution was only incidentally a matter of politics and government, of France or America or of the eighteenth century; primarily, it was a problem of man throughout the ages, and of what God had destined him to be from the foundation of the world. For to Blake the universe and all that concerned man therein were essentially religious facts. As he once wrote to William Hayley, "Such consolations are alone to be found in

religion, the sun and moon of our journey."⁶ He meant it literally. Hence he who would understand Blake must begin with his religion. It is the clue to all his thought, even to his opinions on politics, for, "Are not Religion and Politics the same thing?" he wrote. They were to him.

To attempt to phrase his religious ideas in the language of common speech is to substitute a few barren aphorisms for conceptions which, when apprehended as mythical narrative, enormously dilate the imagination. Blake was capable enough of lucidity when he chose to be lucid. He could cut close to the heart of a matter, crystallizing truth in cameo-like utterances so inevitable that they seem to have existed always. But mysticism does not express itself in simple formulas. It escapes from literalness and embodies itself in symbol. When the heavens rolled back as a scroll, John heard a voice as the voice of many waters, and saw strange marvels: a woman clothed with the sun, a sea of glass mingled with fire, and a city that lieth foursquare, walled with jasper and coming down from God out of heaven. Under some such guise must the mystic always try to suggest the things which words cannot say. To this end Blake was fortunate in being not only a poet but a painter, and thereby possessed of two mediums for communicating the inexpressible. But even so, he was not always successful. His ideas were too tenuous for words to catch, or too vast for his engraver's plate. If ever painter needed a ten-league canvas and brushes of comets' hair, it was this voyager out into the worlds that existed before the building of time. No wonder the matter of fact cannot follow him.

Nothing short of mastery of his mythology avails, for in this realm fragments are but jargon, and a mere narrative utterly bewildering. It is necessary to take time to reconstruct the backgrounds of that timeless, spaceless world of Los in which the giant Albion, and the Daughters of Beulah have their being, before the unfamiliar imagery becomes the medium of thought. The reward of such an attempt which requires more than a modicum of industry and patience, is an almost complete refutation of a once widespread judgment that the Proph-

⁶ Dec. 28, 1804. *Letters of William Blake*, (Edited by A. G. B. Russell), p. 175.

etic books are merely a chatotic mélange, senseless accumulations of unsorted matter, to which Blake himself could have furnished no clue. Thanks to the tireless researches of Mr. Damon,⁷ this heresy has once for all been silenced, and Blake's obscurity shown to be largely due to his choice of an unfamiliar though not unintelligible symbolism.

Without threading all the mazes of this devious path, its general direction and a few guiding lines may be quite simply charted. For reduced to its lowest terms, and losing much thereby, Blake's religious thought amounted in essence to a declaration of personal spiritual intuition. His vast cosmic vision was the result of an individual experience which he did not expect to be duplicated in other men's experiences.

"The Vision of Christ that thou dost see
Is my vision's greatest enemy."⁸

Enough that the way was open to those who would cultivate their spiritual understandings.

To our own day wholly familiar, such a conception of religion was by no means new in Blake's century. He merely reasserted the foundation principle of all mystical thinking in an hour when the voice of the mystic was more than ever a minority voice, for in Blake's day the ear of the world was unusually deafened to whatever was undemonstrable by line and rule. The main currents of religious thought followed Locke in his advocacy of the rationalistic method. By his denial of innate ideas he had limited the sources of knowledge to the evidence of the senses and had practically eliminated the mystical experience.

Prior to Blake's half of the century religious rationalists of various schools had defined and vindicated to their own satisfaction this new method of searching out truth. In Blake's day they busied themselves with its applications. A favorite application concerned the external proofs of Christ's resurrection. One of the surviving books which testifies to contemporary interest in this problem is Thomas Sherlock's *Trial of the Witnesses*, a pamphlet which in the form of a judicial proceeding

⁷ S. Foster Damon, *William Blake, His Philosophy and Symbols*, Boston, 1924.

⁸ *The Everlasting Gospel*, p. 146.

proposed to examine the evidences for the Resurrection.⁹ Its final verdict is eloquent of a state of mind to which spiritual intuition would have been wholly incomprehensible. The last words of the book may speak for themselves.

The Judge questions:

"What say you? Are the apostles guilty of giving false witness in the case of the resurrection of Jesus, or not guilty?"

The Foreman of the Jury answers,

"Not guilty."

The trial is over; the question is settled.¹⁰

When the religious faith of a century depended on such an array of tangible proofs as this pamphlet tiresomely supplies, there was no longer anything worth proving. Reality had departed. Controversy was concerning itself with empty husks.

In the same mood Dr. Priestley, eminent Dissenter, notorious revolutionist, and sometime frequenter along with Blake of the upper room at the bookseller Johnson's, wrote weary *Letters to a Philosophical Unbeliever* proving by direct evidence that God exists, that since a spider web means somewhere a spider, a bird's nest a bird, a honeycomb a bee, therefore an intelligible cause for the universe is an inescapable conclusion. Equally dully, he proved that there is one God, that he is benevolent, that there is an after life, and everything else that man yearns to know. There was no room left for speculation anywhere; all was as certain and hopelessly accurate as the multiplication table.

Utterly devoid of a sense of humor, this eminent gentleman (and, by the way, quite respectable scientist), computed tediously how many miles Jesus must have walked during a certain period of his ministry. From this total (in which he disagreed various miles with the Bishop of Waterford) Priestley estimated how many miles Jesus walked per day; he proceeded to argue that his result (four miles) was not an improbable amount;

⁹ Written in 1729 as a reply to Thomas Woolston's *Discourses on the Miracles*, and ran through fourteen editions.

¹⁰ Having disposed of the resurrection, the author proceeded to get rid of any suggestion of imposture concerning the passage of the Red Sea. In doing so he imagined the whole scene re-enacted at the Thames before the people of London, and reasoned thus: Could Moses possibly have persuaded 600,000 men that he had brought them through the Thames if he had not done so? And what of the thousand witnesses who stood on the bank? Would they have allowed such a claim to go uncontradicted if it had been false?

and then, contrary to all his habits of mind he introduced a speculation, and suggested that occasionally Jesus may not have journeyed on foot. As though it mattered!¹¹

But uncomprehending literalness, to call it by no worse name, reaches its nadir when Priestley attempts to supply comment on the Book of Revelation for "the use of the unlearned."¹² He corrects John's mistakes when his "scenery is not exact" as concerns the candlesticks, (John did not have the proper number in I, 13); he assures the unlearned that they need not be disturbed over the two swords which proceed from the mouth of the Son of Man, (soldiers used to carry their swords so when they were not in use); he explains that the "angel of the church" was the presiding bishop, (not a diocesan bishop since he would have been responsible for more than one church); he delves into ancient economic history and in true research style documents the reference to "a measure of wheat for a penny"; he identifies the locusts as the Saracens by their long hair, only he admits being puzzled over their wings and tails. But as to the city coming down from heaven—it couldn't be done, and he reluctantly admits that this must be figurative.

Such distrust of all that did not correspond to the actual, such attempts to prove all things by the tests of eye and ear, left scant place for the "Holy Ghost's dear revelation," which according to Jacob Boehme broke through the Fleshly Reason and "in the Spirit of God" enabled his innate spirit to see through all.

Such also was Blake's confidence in his visions. Is it any wonder that in flaming anger he broke out against the whole evidential method, and against such industrious attempts to prove religion conformable to reason?

"God forbid," HE CRIED, "that Truth should be Confined to Mathematical Demonstration. He who does not know Truth at sight is unworthy of Her Notice."¹³

When truth could be recognized thus, what was there to prove? Proof was an insult to man's spirit; it was impertinence before

¹¹ *Theological Tracts*, Bath, 1779, II, 78 ff.

¹² *Notes on the Bible*, Northumberland, 1804, IV, 573 ff.

¹³ *Marginal Notes to Reynolds*, II, 340, in *Works of William Blake*, edited by E. J. Ellis and W. B. Yeats, (3 vols.), London, 1893.

God. Like Emerson, Blake could not reason, he only knew. Thus his very gift became a limitation, and he could not understand why all men did not know. To him Bacon's insistence on experiment was at root unbelief, since "none by travelling over known lands can find out the unknown." Such a philosophy had ruined England. Locke too was a knave. In a Fragment of *The Everlasting Gospel* he wrote,

"Did Jesus teach doubt? or did He
Give any lessons of philosophy,
Charge Visionaries with deceiving,
Or call men wise for not believing?"²⁴

Doubtless Blake's own convictions concerning the approach to truth were strengthened by the force of these counter currents against him. For reason was the tool of deists, Dissenters, Evangelicals alike; they differed only in what they endeavored to prove by means of it. Blake, being a despiser of "Reason's fine wrought throne," was in their language an "enthusiast," and content to be such.

With the second goal of the rationalists, the devising of an ethical code guaranteed to keep men out of mischief, Blake had likewise no sympathy. The dreary waste of moral maxims untroubled by a spark of anything higher than the merely practical, touched him no more than the appeal to reason. He did not live in a world in which codes availed, and he would have none of them. Get the fear of God in your heart and never mind the rules, is almost the sum total of his thought concerning conduct. His willingness to trust his instincts has nothing to do with reckless self indulgence, but was born of a conviction that men are not "mere earthly men" but "receptacles of spirit,"

"For All Life is Holy."

Since there was no bounding line between Flesh and Spirit, man might with full warrant rebel against the "Thou shalt nots" written over the chapel door. These had reference to time and space only. In defiance of ancient creeds and eighteenth century pruderies alike, Blake threw down the gauntlet before the religions of the world by declaring,

²⁴ P. 153.

"Man has no Body distinct from his Soul; for that call'd Body is a portion of Soul discern'd by the five Senses, the chief inlets of Soul in this age."²⁵

Such an utterance was worse than heresy. Had not religion from the beginning taught man to keep the body under? Was there not eternal warfare between Flesh and Spirit? Besides, who dared mention the body? It was not quite a fit subject for discussion. Blake had outraged taste as well as orthodoxy. To modern ears accustomed to Whitman's "I sing the Body electric," all this stir seems unnecessary, but Whitman was yet to be born when Blake uttered this heretical doctrine. Even with "the good gray poet" as its later advocate, this is one of the tenets of Blake's faith that the world has been slow to accept. Many a critic from Crabbe Robinson down has thought Blake's distinction between the natural and spiritual worlds "very confused." Some have evaded the issue; some have muddled it by attempting to explain; a few have defended Blake, adding apologetically that the world is not yet ready for such notions; others have shrugged their shoulders and called him a plain fool; still others have denounced him openly with righteous eloquence. Let those who will, argue. Whether Blake be right or wrong, he had a profound sense of the unity of life and of the holiness of life. As he saw it

"Every Natural Effect has a spiritual cause, and not
A Natural: for a Natural Cause only seems."²⁶

In an age which preached repression, restraint, discipline, Blake asserted the rightness of impulse, and declared that a man's native energy was the thing in which he was likest God. To restrain energy was not only to make Holiness negative, but to

"render that a lawless thing,
On which the Soul expands its wing."²⁷

Of such obedience to impulse Jesus was the supreme example, "and he was all virtue." Wesley and Whitefield were preaching the impotency of the moral law. A man might keep all the

²⁵ *Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, p. 248.

²⁶ *The Prophetic Books of William Blake; Milton* (Edited by MacLagan and Russell), London, 1907, p. 27.

²⁷ *The Everlasting Gospel*, (Oxford Edition), p. 157.

Decalogue and yet be unregenerate before God. There was no way but to be "born again." Blake preached rather the impertinence of the moral law. Heaven was not a goal; it was a state of mind and it was attained not because men have

"curbed and governed their passions, or have no passions, but because they have cultivated their understandings. The treasures of heaven are not negations of passion, but realities of intellect from which the passions emanate, uncurbed in their eternal glory."²⁸

Hell was the Negation of this active energy, and consequent "devastation of the things of the Spirit."

Blake's glorification of the human body and the pleasures thereof has been more widely heralded than his views on art, after the fashion of the world we live in, but critics in their stout attacks against his unconventional views have sometimes forgotten that in Blake's mind they had reference first and last to a pure heart, a fact that may continue to bear with it its own condemnations. Doubtless the lengths to which Blake went in stating these beliefs owed something to the elaborate codes by which preachers of the hour sought to cabin and confine the impulses of men. In recoiling from this second aspect of rationalistic religion just as from the first, Blake went further than he might have done in an age more friendly to a mystic's belief in the Oneness of life.

With the Evangelicals, especially Wesley and Whitefield, Blake had more in common than with the Deists and extreme rationalists. Wesley's revolt against an impersonal God was also Blake's. He could not admit the possibility of a remote abstraction. Man in the image of God meant to him God in the image of man, a conviction which his drawings body forth with every representation of deity. In the *Illustrations for the Book of Job* the similarity between Job and God is almost shocking. The two were drawn from the same model and might easily enough have changed places. But to Blake's mind with its insistent necessity to personify all abstract ideas, God looked like a man, and the artist drew what he saw. God, as it were, sat for his portrait.

²⁸ *Sequel to Description of the Last Judgment*, (Ellis and Yeats Edition), II, 401.

The respect which the Evangelicals paid to the individual human soul gave Blake another point of contact with them. Salvation, according to Wesley, was a personal matter. Every man must make his peace with God and receive assurance of pardoned sin. Blake had no interest in a remote salvation, he felt no burden for sin, and he could not remember when his eyes had been opened. Moreover, the Wesleyan doctrine of the atonement was horrible to him; but such differences as these were chiefly theological. With reference to fundamentals, both Wesley and Blake were intense individualists, preaching a personal experience of religion, the one as an escape from eternal damnation, the other as a present liberation of spirit.

That Blake sensed the spirit of the Evangelical revolt is apparent in the lines from *Milton*,¹⁹

"He sent his two Servants, Whitefield and Wesley: Were they
Prophets,
Or were they Idiots or Madmen?—Shew us Miracles!
Can you have greater Miracles than these? Men who devote
Their life's whole comfort to entire scorn and injury and death?"

Thus could Blake pierce to the heart of a matter. He knew the difference between fundamentals and corollaries, always.

But in spite of the sympathy shown by this judgment, the parallelism between Blake and Wesley cannot be traced beyond the major lines of revolt against current orthodoxy, and the assertion of a new democracy in things of the spirit. Both men were strongly individual; neither was willing to accept anything upon authority, but insisted upon having an original relation to the universe; both saw the barrenness and futility of a coldly intellectual religion, and knowing through personal experience the vitality of Christianity, each spoke with authentic voice concerning the realities of a spiritual religion; both repudiated the Calvinistic doctrine of the elect, and opened the gates of eternal life to all.

But here the parallelism ends. Wesley was preëminently a practical man, very slightly developed on the aesthetic side, but enormously gifted as an organizer and active reformer. He was not given to speculation but to action. Accordingly mysticism

¹⁹ Oxford Edition, p. 375.

was a closed book to him, and the ecstasies and visions of the world in which Blake lived arrant nonsense. His rebuke of William Law for having become a Boehmenite, his denunciation of Boehme himself for the highly mischievous doctrine which did away with the wrath of God, his regret over the Swedenborgian account of hell which tended to familiarize that ancient place to "unholy men, to remove all their terror, and make them consider it, not as a place of torment, but as a very tolerable habitation,"—all these judgments and many more, like the computations of Priestley, or rather the cast of mind which both reveal, show these men to have been the children of their age. They may also serve to emphasize the loneliness of Blake as he is viewed against the background of his own day. Priestley was a Dissenter of sufficiently radical views to have been at one time a target for mob violence. His house was burned, and his life endangered to such an extent that he finally sought refuge in America. Wesley's revolutionary and far too liberal religious views brought him ridicule, ostracism, and even persecution. But both Wesley and Priestley fought the orthodoxy of their day with its own weapon, reason. All things were submitted to the common sense test as though there were no other. Such weapons were not suited to Blake's hand. He could not fight except in his own armor; hence he fought alone.

It is no matter for praise or blame that he could walk only a few paces with these men in their championship of more liberal views, or that even in the twentieth century he is still in the van of religious thinkers. Such are facts, partly explicable and partly not. It amounts to this only, that the elements so mixed in Blake that he absorbed little of his age, in matters religions less than in any other direction. He lacked balance, he lacked charity, he lacked many practical virtues, but who will doubt that he lived in the presence of eternity. The twentieth century still views mysticism askance, except as Emersonian phraseology has given its profundities a pulpit currency. But it will be long before any but the most advanced will go all the way with Blake in his reconciliation of contraries. *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* still suffers deletion.

In designating Boehme and Swedenborg for special censure, Wesley was arraigning the two men who perhaps influenced Blake's thought more than any others. They were fellow visionaires rather than teachers, for Blake was no mere borrower of their ideas. Differently endowed in most other ways, the three belong in the same category by virtue of their similar gift for the intuitive approach to truth. Concerning things spiritual, they all spoke the same language, only in Boehme's speech one detects the bias of a Lutheran upbringing, in Swedenborg's the lifelong habit of the laboratory method, and in Blake's the poet's license with symbols.

A list of parallels between Blake's thought and the seventeenth century cobbler's fills many pages without diminishing Blake's stature as an original thinker. The fact is, Blake's mind was alchemical; nothing came out as it went in. The same may be said for the contribution received from Swedenborg, whose influence, being contemporary, was for a time more potent than Boehme's. Swedenborg fed Blake's earlier hunger for an understanding sympathy with his own revolt against shallow intellectualism, and Blake's endorsement of *The Angelic Wisdom* was passionate in proportion. When he later rejected Swedenborg it was not only because he had written all the old falsehoods and not one new truth, but because Blake felt a rigidity underneath the schematized philosophy. There was too much of the laboratory about it for one who had chosen the studio instead. Moreover, Swedenborg did not go far enough. His *Heaven and Hell* kindled Blake's thought, but Blake's *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell* shows how his own mind leaped beyond to the reconciliation of contraries.

There is one other group to be reckoned with in attempting to orient Blake with reference to the religious thought of his day,—the occultists. These represent the extreme swing of the pendulum away from the test of demonstration by the senses. Just how much Blake was interested in them or influenced by them has been a matter of some conjecture. Mr. Chesterton thinks he detects something of Cagliostro in Blake. Possibly, since all men must wear the garments of their time in some measure. Occultism made a great noise in Blake's younger

days, and excitement ran high over Mesmer, Cagliostro, and lesser votaries. Blake's familiarity with the world beyond sense might presumably have quickened an interest in astrology, animal magnetism and magic of various sorts, but it is certain that he would have detected the counterfeit back of all the cheap sensationalism and mummary which attended popular demonstrations of occult power. However one may account for Blake's visions, they stand at the opposite pole from vulgar wonders. He did not think them at all marvelous, but spoke of them as though they were matter of fact occurrences, nor did he ever try to evoke a vision. They came and he tried to paint them. But if the vision fades, what do you do? "Then we pray," was his simple answer. This was not the formula of the occultists. Cagliostro would not have known what Blake was talking about. They lived on different planes.

As a painter, the reversal of Blake's fortunes is material for romance. Heralded as "Pictor Ignotus" by his biographer sixty years ago,²⁰ he has mounted higher and higher among the immortals, until his own prophecies about being a memento in time to come and speaking to future generations by sublime allegory seem in a fair way to be fulfilled. In terms of human satisfactions the contrast between his own London exhibition of 1809, pitiable failure that it was, and the present enthusiasm over the Tate Gallery and British Museum exhibitions brings its own ironical suggestions. So much does it mean to have become a name. His 1809 visitors could not understand even the catalogue of his pictures; his 1925 admirers are safe in their enthusiasm whether they understand it or not.

Blake's unique place among artists is due to his espousal of two arts rather than one, and although he pays the inevitable penalty of a divided heart by failing to win the most coveted laurels in either, he brings to each something that single-mindedness could never have achieved. He is the sort of "new painter" Browning's *Monsignor* describes, "a poet, now, or a musician, (spirits who have conceived and perfected an Ideal through some other channel), transferring it to this, and escaping our conventional roads by pure ignorance of them."²¹

²⁰ Alexander Gilchrist, *Life of William Blake*, (2 vols.), London, 1863.

²¹ *Pippa Passes*, Cambridge Edition, p. 142.

The extreme of Blake's revolution against the art theories and practices of his day is to be found in his attack upon Reynolds, the idol of the hour. Back of this attack, which is thoroughly characteristic of Blake in its fearlessness and lack of respect for the opinions of others, there is first of all an intense conviction that art is primarily idea, and not technique. It is the application of this criterion to Blake's own work which has changed the world's estimate of his pictures. A critic of the schools can prove Blake's women to be badly drawn, his headlong angels somewhat less than angels in "strong level flight"; he can find a hundred faults of composition, of line and mass and color combination, and then have made only a beginning. Just such judgments made Blake's 1809 exhibition a failure and postponed his coronation.

Nor need we of the twentieth century flatter ourselves that his rejection was the crime of an undreaming age, or that we are any less gross or any more spiritual with all our homage and our fortunes paid for a single fading print. We are merely more intelligent in studying his pictures and his poetry together, thus finding "the end of the golden string" which in this case leads to understanding.

Blake was not trying to copy nature; he was trying to paint a vision.

"This life's five windows of the soul
Distorts the Heavens from pole to pole,
And leads you to believe a lie
When you see with, not thro, the eye."²²

When Blake looked through his eye, he saw spiritual truth personifying itself in fleshly form. The theme might be "The Prayer of the Infant Jesus," "Paola and Francesca," or "The Burial of Moses;" it was equally remote from the world in which elaborately dressed men and women of quality came to sit for expensive portraits. No wonder Blake felt himself in chains when he painted the illustrations for the *Wits Magazine* or the conventional subjects which Hayley set before him. These gave him no opportunity to travel to heaven in his thoughts, and unless a man could do that, he was no artist.

²² *The Everlasting Gospel*, pp. 152-3.

Blake knew that art so conceived could not be taught by any master to any pupil. It was the gift of God. Hence his strictures against Reynolds for minimizing inspiration and exalting education. To Blake the knowledge of ideal beauty was not to be acquired. It was one of the innate ideas eighteenth century "fools and knaves" had denied. For according to Blake,

"Man Brings All that he has or Can have Into the World with him."²³

With this as a premise, Reynold's opinion that Genius could be taught, and "that all pretence to Inspiration is a lie and a deceit," made the whole Bible madness.

"I say," (Blake almost seems to shout), "Taste and Genius are Not Teachable nor Acquirable, but are both born with us."²⁴

Thus did William Blake, a self-styled "mental prince," "decolate and hang the souls" not only of princes who patronized blockheads, but of those who by them were "hired to depress art," as in a moment of exaggeration he once wrote of Sir Joshua himself.²⁵

Blake's opinions on education have been deplored by some of his critics as particularly graceless, coming as they did from one who in the technical sense of the word was almost totally uneducated.

"Thank God!" he burst out,
I never was sent to school
To be flogg'd into following the style of a fool."²⁶

And who is not glad that he wasn't? A little more tolerance of other men's opinions is the best the schools might have done for him, but William Blake tolerant is by just so much not William Blake at all. The mystic's immunity from the sins of the body he never claimed (nor preached), but the freedom of genius from "mind-forged manacles" he demanded as his birthright.

"Improvement makes straight roads; but the crooked roads without improvement are roads of Genius."

²³ *Marginal Notes to Reynolds*, (Ellis and Yeats Edition), II, 337.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, II, 340.

²⁵ *Ibid.*, II, 318.

²⁶ *On the Foundation of the Royal Academy*, p. 201.

"The tigers of wrath are wiser than the horses of instruction," he wrote in *The Marriage of Heaven and Hell*.²⁷

Why then "wheel without wheel, with cogs tyrannic?" In a conversation with Crabbe Robinson he went so far as to call education a sin. "It is eating of the tree of the knowledge of good and evil. That was the fault of Plato," he said.²⁸

Making allowance for Blake's petulance in such utterances and for his habit of over-statement when aroused, his arraignment of whatever cramps originality or cripples thought in education, has a strangely modern sound. He spoke from partial knowledge and his denunciations were too sweeping, but he penetrated to the root of the matter, and his arguments against whatever is mechanical and shackling are unanswerable, and timely, a century later.

His preference for the Gothic as living, over the Grecian as mathematical form, his insistence upon the firm line rather than the impressionistic blur, upon precision of detail rather than generalization, his criticism of the Venetian and Flemish schools, and his approval of the Florentine, all show him sharply out of step with theories current in his day, and refusing allegiance to idols of the hour.

His reward was almost complete loneliness, and might have been starvation but for the generosity of Butts and Linnell. It is a dreary story, the story of a discredited man, working on, not months but years; incessantly, devoutly, for a mere pittance, with almost no approbation save his own (and of course Catherine's). Unstable his temperament may have been, but in loyalty to an unseen perfection, he stood the hardest test of all, continuity. And in sheer courage he was a giant.

In the matter of politics there is less to say. Blake's opinions on this subject were dictated by the same principles which lay back of his attack on the priesthood and other human institutions which he believed to be tyrannical. He had no statesmanlike grasp of large issues, no comprehending solution for vast economic problems. Indeed, he worked toward no definite temporal objectives at all. But with the same uncompromis-

²⁷ Pp. 252; 251.

²⁸ Dec. 10, 1825. Arthur Symonds, *William Blake*, New York, 1907. P. 256.

ing individualism which characterized his thought in other directions, he demanded for all men, liberation of spirit.

To Blake, as to Wordsworth, the Revolution in its earlier history promised just such a regeneration of society. Tradition was at last to be cast off; men were to be free to forge out a new life. In this confidence Blake eagerly allied himself with the supporters of radicalism, and wrote his *French Revolution*. But his ardor was shortlived; massacre and excess of horror sickened him. War no longer appeared to be the pathway to human redemption. Baffled, disillusioned, he ceased to make human affairs his concern at all, and withdrew into his own world of more enduring realities.

The three poems which record Blake's interest in the Revolution most fully, *The French Revolution* (a fragment), *America*, and *Europe* are not epics of history, as one might suppose from their titles. They are rather vast myths which stretch backward as far as human aspiration and forward to the millennium itself. Blake's scheme was always cosmic; 1776 and 1789 were only the middle of the story; he must tell also the beginning and the end. He would write not of the French Revolution, but of the human revolution in which France and America were but passing incidents.

One looks in vain for theories of government or for a program that society may follow. Blake was no more capable of programming human advancement than was Walt Whitman. Both men painted on large canvasses. Both tore the world to fragments and built it over again. They looked at life, full circle, "Past, Present and Future existing all at once." (*Jerusalem*, p. 388.) And both came to the same conclusion. There was but one path to world redemption. Mankind was to be saved not by vast upheavals which involve continents and nations, but one man at a time. Hence both were concerned with man's spiritual history, not with his part in outward events. Blake's vision, like Whitman's, was a flash of insight, not a well thought out process. Other men with the practical gifts he lacked must chart the path by which vision becomes reality.

Small wonder that Blake was ineffective in his own day. In hours of crisis men cannot wait for millenniums; they de-

mand immediacy. Besides, who was speaking? A poor painter who believed the world to be flat. A madman who talked naively of dining with Isaiah and of "standing by when Jesus died." What could he know? It has taken the better part of a century for the lesser things to fall away, and for the majesty of Blake's conceptions to triumph over personal limitations and pettiness.

In a sense the years have justified him, and on the eve of his centenary his words come home as truth,

"Time may rage but rage in vain."

Defiance or any other weapon is no longer necessary; he has been acclaimed. He is no longer an enigma; his oracles have been interpreted. His unorthodox views no longer startle; Nietzsche, Tolstoi, Whitman, Shaw, have come in between and made heresy less heretical. These men did not consciously borrow from Blake; he was still safely obscure when they first gained a hearing. Blake's anticipation of their supposedly modern doctrines is rather a confirmation of his own words spoken in praise of Gothic figures and buildings. Let them, he said, "not talk of Dark Ages, or of any Age, Ages are all equal, but Genius is always above The Age."²⁰

Such Blake's genius seemed to be. At times his is the voice of primitive man untouched by civilization, and wholly innocent of culture. At other times, he leaps across the centuries to far millenniums, not unmindful of stages of human progress already passed, and of others yet to be. Unpredictable and inexplicable, the birth of such a man is after all the principal human event.

Blake's right to Arnold's famous epithet, "liberal of the future," may perhaps be justly challenged. Liberalism in the largest sense means sanity, serenity, intellectual grasp, in fuller measure than Blake possessed them. Moreover, it was not breadth at all, but distance that determined his seeing. "Full of futurity" his heart truly was, but it was a futurity which had scant reference to the developments of a century, or of many centuries. For to use his own word, he conceived our life here as lived "in eternity's sunrise."

²⁰ *Marginal Notes to Reynolds*, (Ellis and Yeats Edition), II, 330.

His thought will continue to filter down to men through a thousand secondary channels; never except to the few will it flow directly. As he said of Swedenborg, so may we say of Blake:

"Any man of mechanical talents may, from the writings of Paracelsus or Jacob Behmen, produce ten thousand volumes of equal value with Swedenborg's, and from those of Dante or Shakespeare an infinite number.

But when he has done this, let him not say that he knows better than his master, for he only holds a candle in sunshine."⁸⁰

⁸⁰ *Marriage of Heaven and Hell*, p. 259.

The Genesis of Henry Clay's American System

E. MERTON COULTER

University of Georgia

In a speech made in the House of Representatives on March 30 and 31, 1824, Henry Clay laid down clearly and forcefully his views on the tariff and called the policy he advocated the American System ("American policy").¹ To allow the products of the world to enter the United States duty free was essentially a foreign system enriching and aggrandizing alien people at the expense of his own country; hence, American industries must be protected. Clay had long held these views, though he had not elaborated them and organized them so fully before.

Why Clay, a representative from a raw pioneer section, should have so prominently identified himself with a doctrine which seemed essentially an expression of the older industrialized Eastern states is generally explained as just an expression, first of the broad national attitude Clay had assumed before the war with Great Britain, and secondly of a desire to protect Kentucky hemp. The industries which had been built up during the War of 1812 should not be allowed to succumb to the onslaught of British merchants, now that the war was over.² These views have generally been considered as a logical and sufficient explanation for Clay's position on the tariff.

While these reasons might well enough account for an essentially frontier statesman advocating a program which seemed to favor Pennsylvania or Massachusetts more than Kentucky, yet in reality they are not the cause so much as the accumulative evidence of an attitude of mind that Clay had assumed long before war with England had come to dominate his thoughts. Clay's first reported speech in Congress, in 1810, had been an appeal for protection for home industries, and he made it clear in the beginning that the home industries he had particularly

¹ *Annals of Congress*, 18th Cong., 1st Sess., II, 1962-2001: *The Ashland Test Book, being a Compendium of Mr. Clay's Speeches on various Public Measures* (Boston, 1844), 12-19.

² Later Clay came to connect internal improvements and the distribution of the surplus revenues from land sales with his American System, and it is generally the more inclusive program that is understood by the term.

in mind were west of the Alleghanies, and moreover, were in the Commonwealth of Kentucky. He began his speech by saying; "The local interest, Mr. President, of the quarter of the country which I have the honor to represent will apologize for the trouble I may give you on this occasion." He spoke of the great advantage of having the country made self-sufficing, manufacturing what it needed and thereby relieving itself from dependence on foreign countries.³ As previously suggested, Clay's interest at this time was more in Kentucky than in the nation at large, and it was the situation in Kentucky that made him the greatest tariff advocate of his time—the father of the American System.

This pioneer commonwealth had scarcely deserted its forts and stockades before it began to have broad visions of a prosperity built on manufactures. The West was cut off from the markets of the Eastern states and of the rest of the world by the Alleghany Mountains on the one hand and by the Spaniards astride the Mississippi River on the other. Kentucky, the first important settlement in this region, would seize her opportunities and not only supply herself with manufactures but also the rest of the West as it should become populated. It was remarkable that pioneers in coon-skin caps and leather breeches should turn with such speed and determination toward a staid industrialism which the East was still far from having embraced.

Harry Innes, the attorney for the District of Kentucky, wrote John Brown, a delegate in the Confederation Congress in 1788, "If ever we are a great and happy people, it must arise from our industry and attention to manufactures."⁴ He was concerned about the navigation of the Mississippi at this time particularly because the Spaniards' obstruction of this highway would "deprive us of the power of erecting any considerable manufactories because we shall have no means of procuring the materials to erect and carry on the different

³ *Annals of Congress*, 11th Cong., 1st and 2nd Sess. (1809-1810), part 1, pp. 626-629. This speech was called forth in defense of a clause in a bill appropriating money to buy munitions of war. This particular clause called upon the navy in making its purchases of sail cloth, hemp, and other kindred supplies to give preference to "fabrics and articles of the manufacture and growth of the United States" when it could be done without detriment to the service. Clay was successful in retaining this provision. Also see T. H. Clay, *Henry Clay* (Philadelphia, 1910), 51.

⁴ *Innes MSS.* (Library of Congress), vol. 18. Feb. 20, 1788.

branches, which can only be procured from abroad."⁵ That these pioneers were not simply dreamers of future prosperity is shown by the fact that they organized in 1789 the Kentucky Manufacturing Society for the purpose of making cotton cloth and stockings.⁶ After a short time they bought machinery in Philadelphia, floated it down the Ohio, and enstalled it in a plant which they had erected in Danville.⁷ This mill long served the West.⁸

A veritable era of manufacturing seems to have set in about this time. A product so necessary as salt, of course, engaged immediate attention—in fact it had been manufactured in large quantities as early as 1777.⁹ At the very time the Danville cotton factory was being agitated, Jacob Meyer began the erection of a paper mill, stating that "He flatters himself that in the execution of an undertaking which promises such advantages to this district, he will meet with the greatest encouragement from every good citizen who wishes to see arts and manufactories flourish."¹⁰ In this same year, 1787, a spinning-wheel factory was set up making "wheels of every construction," which could be had "for cash or country produce, and that on the shortest notice;"¹¹ also a tan yard was opened which agreed to tan all hides excepting those of the buffalo.¹² A "Hat Manufactory" was started in 1792, which informed the public that "Ladies and Gentlemen may be supplied on short notice."¹³ Not all of the tobacco, which early came to be one of the most important crops of the farmers, found its way down to New Orleans and beyond, for a tobacco factory was running near Lexington as early as 1793.¹⁴ And not all the grain raised was

⁵ *Ibid.* Innes to John Brown, Dec. 7, 1787.

⁶ *Kentucky Gazette* (published in Lexington by John Bradford), Oct. 31, 1789, Feb. 13, 1790; *Innes MSS.*, vol. 24. The original records are preserved here.

⁷ *Innes MSS.*, vol. 19. John Brown to Innes, April 27, 1790; also vol. 24. Records of July 8, 1790.

⁸ *Ibid.*

⁹ James R. Robertson, *Petitions of the Early Inhabitants of Kentucky* (Filson Club Publication, No. 27. Louisville, 1914), 43, 44.

¹⁰ *Kentucky Gazette*, Aug. 15, 1787. Paper was soon being manufactured at this mill and at other ones in sufficient quantities to supply the *Kentucky Gazette* with print paper. It announced in its issue for March 30, 1793, that the paper used that day had been made by Craig Parkes & Co., at Georgetown.

¹¹ *Kentucky Gazette*, Sept. 8, 1787.

¹² *Ibid.*, Oct. 13.

¹³ *Ibid.*, April 14, 1792.

¹⁴ *Ibid.*, Sept. 28, 1793.

being eaten or shipped in bulk down the river; the distilleries that were to win fame for the state had already begun their work before 1800. This notice appeared in 1798: "To Distillers and others who may incline to carry on the business of rectifying spirituous liquors and the manufacturing cordials in an extensive manner, may now be supplied with the necessary articles for carrying on the same by applying at the sign of Andrew M'Calla's Shop near the Stray Penn, Lexington."¹⁵

An early historian, Winterbotham, attested the industrial progress that had come to the state before 1800, declaring that a "paper mill, oil mill, fulling mills and a great number of valuable grist mills" had been erected. There were also many salt works and maple sugar mills. He added, "Laborers, especially tradesmen, are especially wanted here."¹⁶ But with all the various manufactories that had sprung up in the small towns and along the country roads, that booming prosperity which had been looked forward to so confidently had not yet arrived in a sufficient force to satisfy. Money was necessary to carry on trade, and little was to be found. A hat factory announced that it would accept for its products cash, of course, but also "Young Cows and Sheep."¹⁷ The people were too prodigal with the money they had. They seemed to think "that dollars at any time might be gathered from the tops of Hickorys and Buckeyes, and their only anxiety should be, by what means to get rid of them fast enough." And the worst part of the trouble was that they were spending their money for Eastern and foreign luxuries, thus draining Kentucky of its medium of exchange. A Kentuckian declared that "Pack-horses, and even wagons, loaded with dollars destined for Philadelphia remittances, have been latterly no uncommon sight on the high roads of this country, but a few years since a wilderness." There was only one remedy: Manufacturing should be so highly developed that the state would not only make everything it needed and thereby keep its dollars at home, but it should serve the rest of the country and draw dollars to itself. "Exporta-

¹⁵ *Lexington Herald*, April 17, 1798.

¹⁶ W. Winterbotham, *An Historical, Geographical, Commercial and Philosophical View of the American United States and of the European Settlements in America and the West Indies* (London, 1795), III, 155.

¹⁷ *Kentucky Gazette*, April 14, 1792.

tion, not importation, is your Way to Wealth," declared this pioneer industrialist.¹⁸

Time and again these Kentucky leaders preached to the people that the road to prosperity and away from hard times should be lined with factories and workshops—Kentucky must stop spending her money for manufactures made outside the state.¹⁹ Acting on this advice, the "Bourbon Association" sprang up in Paris in 1800 and instituted one of the earliest boycotts west of the Alleghanies. It announced that its members would refuse after April 1st to "purchase from merchants, traders or others, any of the following enumerated, imported, manufactured articles, to wit: Woolens, linens, cottons, silks, hats, shoes, saddles, sugars or imported liquors of any kind (wines used as a medicine, or in religious societies only excepted) unless the same can be purchased and paid for in articles made of the growth or manufactures of this state." The members took a solemn oath to abide by this declaration of industrial independence and decided to hold monthly meetings to strengthen their faith and extend the work.²⁰

Frontiersmen were eminently practical; every article or institution ought to have an economic value. It was particularly desirable that government should engage in activities more useful than merely enunciating pleasing political theories. Hence as early as 1798 demands were being made upon the legislature for aid in building cotton factories. A company organized at this time informed that body that it could secure everything necessary for manufacturing cotton cloth except the capital, and begged of these lawmakers the loan of a thousand pounds.²¹ The legislature was unmoved; but two years later the governor in his message queried: "Whether it might not be expedient for the legislature to encourage manufacturing men of industry, probity, and ability,—by affording such pecuniary aids as may be deemed consistent with the interests and resources of the commonwealth."²²

¹⁸ *The Mirror* (published in Washington, Kentucky), Nov. 18, 1797. "Merlin."

¹⁹ For example, *Palladium* (published at Frankfort), Jan. 30, 1800. Numerous like appeals may be found in this paper.

²⁰ *Palladium*, May 13, 1800.

²¹ *Ibid.*, Aug. 4, 1801.

²² *Palladium*, Nov. 4, 1800. The legislature later aided industries by encouraging inventions and also by levying a tax on foreign goods brought into the state. See *Acts of Kentucky*, 1813, p. 223; *Argus* (published in Frankfort), Nov. 16, 1831.

Such was the industrial atmosphere into which Henry Clay was ushered when he migrated from Virginia to Kentucky in 1797 and settled in Lexington. The prevailing topic of conversation, apart from thoroughbred horses, which had already made their appearance, was manufactures.²³ Clay was now a young lawyer not quite twenty-one years of age, keen and alert, ready to identify himself with the community and to go forward with it "to fame and fortune." Nothing could be more natural for him with his perspicacity to seize on to the doctrine of industrial development not only because it seemed to be based on sound and reasonable principles but because it would be a sure road to preferment.

Lexington was then not only the industrial center of the state but also of the whole West. In 1802 it had paper mills, rope-walks, potteries, powder-mills, and tanneries;²⁴ and by 1810 it had added among other manufactures an "Oil Floor Cloth Manufactory," which called "for the patriotic encouragement of our citizens." In announcing this new industry a Lexington newspaper said, "It is a proud satisfaction to us, that every day renders our country more independent of foreign aid, and conspicuous for improvements."²⁵ A traveller who passed through Lexington at this time said that it was "expected to become the largest inland town in the United States" and he added, "Perhaps there is no manufactory in the country which is not found here."²⁶ In 1817 Lexington had twelve cotton factories, three woolen mills, three paper mills, gunpowder mills valued at 9,000 pounds, a lead factory, iron and brass foundries, four hat factories, four coach factories, five tanneries and curriers, twelve factories for cotton bagging and hempen yarn, six cabinet works, four soap and candle factories, three tobacco factories, and various other factories valued at 120,000 pounds. The total valuation of Lexington's manufactories at this time was 467,225 pounds.²⁷ Clay was in the midst of this

²³ This statement is based on the cumulative evidence of the records of the day, such as the *Kentucky Gazette*, *Lexington Herald*, *Palladium*, *Mirror* and the *Innes MSS.* and *Breckinridge MSS.*

²⁴ Lewis and Richard H. Collins, *History of Kentucky* (Covington, 1874), II, 175. F. A. Michaux.

²⁵ *Lexington Reporter*, quoted in *Kentucky Gazette*, May 29, 1810.

²⁶ F. Cuming, quoted in G. W. Ranck, *History of Lexington, Kentucky* (Cincinnati, 1872), p. 241. See also J. B. McMaster, *History of the People of the United States* (New York, 1912), III, 505.

²⁷ Collins, *Kentucky*, II, 176.

bustling industrialism, and it was not simply because he happened to raise hemp that he came to espouse a protective tariff.²⁸ He felt that the prosperity of Lexington and of Kentucky, itself, depended on these industries.

Indeed, throughout the state as a whole in 1810, there were fifteen cotton mills, thirteen cotton bagging mills, twenty-one carding machines, thirty-three fulling mills, four furnaces, three forges, eleven naileries, two hundred and sixty-seven tanneries, nine flaxseed oil mills, two thousand distilleries, six paper mills, thirty-eight rope walks, sixty-three gunpowder mills, thirty six salt works, and during this same year there was produced 5,755 tons of prepared hemp, 2,471,647 pounds of maple sugar, and 201,937 pounds of saltpetre.²⁹ The value of all the state's manufactured products in this year was \$6,181,024.³⁰ Kentucky had more cotton factories than any other state in the South or West; she manufactured more "blended cloths and stuffs" than any other state in the Union excepting North Carolina, and she made practically all the cotton bagging in the nation. She stood first in the number of gunpowder mills, third in the number of distilleries, and fourth in the number of cotton and woolen looms; in the number of fulling mills she was ahead of every state in the South and West excepting Virginia; she stood third in the number of naileries in the South and West and second in the number of tanneries and paper mills; she had more rope-walks than any other state with the possible exception of Massachusetts; and she stood second in the amount of salt manufactured.³¹ Her enthusiasm for manufactures and her intelligent interest in them were surpassed by no state in the Union.

Clay became the outstanding exponent of this industrialism. This doctrine appearing in one of the state newspapers in 1806 was his though the wording may have belonged to someone else: "The local situation of the state of Kentucky, which has deprived it of those sources on which the exchange of agricul-

²⁸ See J. M. Rogers, *The True Henry Clay* (Philadelphia, 1904), 44, 45.

²⁹ *American State Papers, Finance* (Washington, 1832), II, 790-794. Also see

³⁰ *American State Papers, Finance*, II, 713. Also see *Niles' Register*, VI, 249, part 2, p. 2232; Humphrey Marshall, *History of Kentucky* (Frankfort, 1824), II, 455.

³¹ "American Manufactures" in *Annals of Congress*, 11 Cong., 1st and 2nd Sess.,

³² *American State Papers, Finance*, II, 690-711.

tural produce depends, particularly requires that markets should be created at home, that should open a field to industry, consume the surplus of our present consumption, afford us in return the several conveniences of life.—In short, that without crossing either the Alleghany, or descending the Mississippi, we should be supplied with manufactures equal to those of Great Britain, and with wines of equal quality as those of France or Spain."³² Clay talked for home manufactures and fought for them, literally so. In 1809 he introduced in the Kentucky legislature a set of resolutions calling for every member after June 20th to dress in clothing of Kentucky manufacture. An acrimonious debate followed, precipitated by Humphrey Marshall, which became so bitter that Clay challenged Marshall to a duel. In the encounter that followed Clay received a wound.³³ The resolutions were passed with only two dissenting votes.³⁴ Kentucky was seriously in earnest; she did not deserve to succeed in building up her industries unless her citizens would patronize them and eschew all others. Patriotism and the Kentucky trademark were synonymous. One of the participants in the Fourth of July celebration in Lexington in 1809 remarked that "It gave us great pleasure on this occasion to observe a considerable number of our citizens clad in domestic manufactures."³⁵

The embargo against European importations, which the United States passed in 1807, greatly aided the Kentucky manufactories. In 1809 this law was repealed, and immediately a cry went up in Kentucky for protection. The hemp growers declared that manufactories had grown up and flourished under the protection of the embargo, that much new capital had been invested, and that they had understood the purpose of the measure to be as much to change people from commercial to manufacturing pursuits as to bring England to a sense of justice. "Already there is manufactured in Kentucky," they said, "a quantity of baling linen sufficient for the consumption of the greater part of the cotton country; other manu-

³² *Western World* (published in Frankfort), July 7, 1806.

³³ *Palladium*, Jan. 27, 1809; *Lexington Reporter*, Jan. 26, 1809.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, Jan. 19, 23.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, July 8.

factories are erecting, and several citizens are extending their views to finer linen and sail cloth." Congress was protecting the fisheries and spending much money in the Eastern states; it was now time for Kentucky to receive attention.³⁶

The state soon began to develop a strong protection policy, frankly basing it on permanent principles, unaffected by the exigencies of war, embargoes, and other makeshifts. Many petitions were circulated for signatures and sent to Congress.³⁷ One, directed to the Senate on January 22, 1811, gives clearest the state's position and arguments.³⁸ It was signed by "LEWIS SAUNDERS and one hundred and twelve others"; but there can be little doubt that Clay inspired it if he did not actually write it. As he was a member of Congress at this time, it was, of course, impolitic for him to sign it; but the arguments in it bear a marked resemblance to the speech he made in 1824, when he elaborated his American System.

In this petition the prediction of hard times which would be caused by a flood of foreign imports was made, and this Clay could in 1824 describe as having come to pass in the prevailing distress into which all seemed to be plunged. The flourishing trade of 1811 was ephemeral, growing out of wartime conditions; when peace should come the American manufactures would find no market in Europe, Asia, or Africa. Markets had to be built up at home to absorb all the manufactures, and thus render America independent of Europe and her edicts. Protection to American industry would benefit all alike: "Whatever gives life to the domestic industry of the country, benefits every man in it." The argument that one section of the country would be benefitted at the expense of another was fallacious. This doctrine enunciated in 1811 was Clay's American System, which he acclaimed in 1824. It was only a step from the concept of protection for Kentucky industry to a protective tariff for the whole country. In fact Kentucky's position on industrial development had never been narrow and selfish. Of course, in the early period of her expansion, she naturally had her own

³⁶ *American State Papers, Finance*, II, 367, 368; *Annals of Congress*, 11 Cong., 1st and 2nd Sess., part 2, pp. 2170-2173.

³⁷ *Kentucky Gazette*, Sept. 18, Dec. 25, 1810; McMaster, *History of the People of the United States*, III, 507.

³⁸ *American State Papers, Finance*, II, 465-467.

industries in mind particularly, but she never feared the competition of the Eastern states. She had by 1811 come to see that protection to Kentucky industries could never be secure except by Congressional action, which would make it uniform for the whole country. She was perfectly satisfied to assume the larger view by 1811.

In the light of his surroundings and his political training, it was as natural for Clay to advocate a protective tariff and formulate his American system as it was for Calhoun to oppose it. Clay's tariff views were not called forth by mere hatred of England nor simply because he was a hemp planter; he was truly representing a state of mind that prevailed Kentucky and an actual industrialism by no means inconsiderable.

Andrew Johnson and the South

CURTIS NETTELS
University of Wisconsin

Andrew Johnson was prepared for the presidency by a lifetime of contact with public affairs. He entered politics at the age of twenty and advanced steadily thereafter to higher and higher office. He served in both branches of the Tennessee legislature, in both houses of Congress, and as governor of his state—both as ordinary civil administrator before the war and as military governor during the war. His term as vice-president had barely begun when he became Lincoln's successor in April, 1865. Out of his relation to the political struggle of the fifties and early sixties he evolved a set of convictions which controlled his action during the hard years of his presidency. These convictions rested upon his own experience and were shaped largely by the emotional elements of his character.

At the bottom of his ideas were his devotion to democracy and his intense nationalism. He regarded the common people as the creators of all wealth; he thought them capable of self-government; he desired to earn his title to fame through service to them; he felt sharply the injustice to which thousands of people are born, and he longed to equalize the conditions under which men worked and lived and sought to enjoy life.

His nationalism was of a positive and even a fiery character. He deprecated the extremes of sectionalism. He tried to look into the future and to visualize the United States as a great nation—great in material resources, in population, in laws and government. He felt strongly about national destiny, and spoke fervently because earnestly for a policy of national development. He saw in the United States more than a series of state boundaries. "If a man lives in the county in which I live," he said, "and if he can, by crossing into another county, better his condition, I say let him go. If by crossing the boundary of my state and going into another, he can better his condition, I say let him go. If a man can go from Tennessee into Illinois, or Mississippi or Arkansas, or any other state, and better his condition, let him go. I care not where he goes, so that he

locates himself in this great area of freedom, becomes attached to our institutions, and interested in the prosperity and welfare of the country." His plea for the maintenance of the Union in 1861 was strongly nationalistic in its tone. "My faith is strong," he protested, "that a thing so monstrously wrong as this rebellion cannot triumph . . . I say let the battle go on—it is Freedom's cause—until the Stars and Stripes . . . shall again be unfurled upon every cross-road, and from every house-top, throughout the confederacy, North and South. Let the Union be reinstated, let the law be enforced, let the Constitution be supreme."

Johnson's attachment to democracy and his nationalism led him to develop a view of the relation between state and federal governments which diverged from the views of his Southern colleagues in the Senate. He believed that the United States, considered as a whole, was more democratic than many of the individual states. Inasmuch as the Constitution permitted the inclusion within the Union of what he regarded as undemocratic members, he did not believe that American democracy rested upon the Constitution, but upon the majority of the state governments, particularly those in the North and West. Taking the states together, he considered that they formed a free and democratic nation. His purpose was to preserve this union of generally free states and to democratize the members which, until the war, had refused to popularize their institutions.

As he believed that American democracy rested upon a foundation broader than the Constitution, so also he believed that the Union had claims to existence that extended beyond the Constitution. He realized that the United States in 1860 was different in nature from the Confederation of 1789. The states admitted after the original thirteen, he held, were not independent and sovereign, but, instead, owed obligations to the government which had given them birth, and had supported them during the early stages of their history with grants of land and military aid. In return for these services, the new states were indebted to the federal government and limited in a way in which the original states were not limited. This view pointed to the corollary that the Union, in 1860, was more

powerful and inviolate, in relation to half the states, than it had been when it was first established. From this idea of the superiority of the Union to the new states, he derived the theory of national supremacy, and, indeed, even insisted upon a sort of law of national necessity. Because both American democracy and the Union were broader than the Constitution, he was content to see it violated if such action were necessary to their preservation.

For the southern leaders who wanted to destroy this democratic Union and to set up a slave-holding aristocracy in the South, he felt the liveliest indignation and even hatred. Compared with his contemporaries in the South, he was so violent and extreme in his views that he came to be regarded as a radical of the most pronounced type. The strain of the war stimulated him again and again to angry denunciations of his opponents. Throughout his speeches there were no traces of the charity and restraint which characterized Lincoln's appeals for unity at the close of the war. His utterances after 1860 marked him as a firebrand—an irreconcilable opponent of the aristocracy of the South. Consequently, when he became president on April 15, 1865, that element in the North which hoped to make the South suffer for its conduct regarded him as an agent especially sent to execute their designs.

Between the time of his nomination for the vice-presidency in 1864 and the summer of 1865, when the outlines of his Reconstruction policy first became recognizable, he received a great many letters from persons of violent, vindictive, or extremely partisan disposition, assuming and urging that he would insist upon punishing the South and that he would push such a policy with the utmost determination and severity.

Those who believed that the new president desired to deal harshly with the South derived this belief from four sources. The first was his attitude toward the southern leaders, constantly expressed after November 1860 in abusive and often scurrilous harrangues. The second was his view of the Union—his insistence upon its supremacy and upon the paramount necessity of enforcing its laws, together with his denial of the right of secession. The third was his conduct when war gov-

error of Tennessee, and the fourth, his haste, shortly after the inauguration, in authorizing the order for the arrest of Jefferson Davis and other southern leaders on the charge of responsibility for the murder of President Lincoln.

Examined one by one, these elements in Johnson's attitude and career do not afford convincing evidence of a desire on his part for punishing the whole South. That he hated the leaders of the Confederacy is no proof that he ever intended to visit the southern people with vindictive measures. He viewed secession as a product of the intrigues of politicians, and not as the chosen policy of the rank and file. They had merely been misled into taking part in the war, and would come to their senses as soon as the activities of their leaders were suppressed. As military governor he had outlined a policy of state reconstruction which aimed to restore control of the state immediately to the loyal, and soon afterwards, to all of, the white population. Johnson's hatred of aristocracy and his sympathy for the common run of people enabled him to adopt a policy of severity toward the Confederate leaders and one of leniency toward the mass of the Southerners, and to do this consistently.

Superficially, it might appear that Johnson's view of the supremacy of the nation over the state would lead him, after the war, to sanction measures which would exalt the power of the Union over that of the defeated states. In case of a life-and-death conflict between state and nation, Johnson would always, perhaps, have supported the latter. But for ordinary times and events, his view of the federal relationship was that of a Jacksonian Democrat. He wanted the states to maintain their identity in all of their traditional dignity. As a corollary to his denial of the right of secession stood his doctrine that the status of the individual state was unimpaired by the events of the war. Each state had retained in full vitality all of its old rights under the Constitution. He realized that on the issue of slavery, in order to preserve the Union, the authority of the nation had to be asserted and the states had to suffer an encroachment, through constitutional amendment, upon their reserved powers. This was one of the cases wherein the perpetuity of the Union was at stake. In respect to lesser issues,

which did not involve the nation's security, he proposed to leave the states as powerful agencies, composing a union more sacred and powerful than themselves.

Johnson's conduct as war governor furnished hope to the northern radicals in 1865 because he had been more severe in dealing with ex-Confederates than President Lincoln had proposed to be. He had imposed an amnesty oath upon rebel Tennesseans more exacting than the one prescribed by President Lincoln. He had manipulated the election of 1864 so as to secure a victory of the radicals over the conservatives and thereby to carry the state for Lincoln and himself. He had suppressed the anti-Union forces in November 1864 when delegates were elected to the state constitutional convention, and so had placed the radicals in charge of the work of reconstructing the state. These things seemed to indicate to unthinking northern radicals that in Johnson they had a man of their own stripe.

Yet Johnson's actions in Tennessee were altogether consistent with those of his presidential term. His participation in the election of 1864 was conditioned upon the theory that Tennessee was in the Union and therefore was entitled to cast its vote in the electoral college. Opposed to this view was that expressed in a joint resolution of Congress for throwing out the Tennessee vote on the ground that the state had "rebelled against the government of the United States, and was in such a condition on the 8th day of November, 1864, that no valid election for electors of president and vice-president" had taken place. The difference between the radicals in Tennessee in the fall of 1864 and the radicals in the North in 1866 was a considerable one. The former in 1864 stood for ending the war with a decisive Union victory and for the abolition of slavery, whereas the latter in 1866 had accepted a plan for giving Congress the privilege of managing the domestic concerns of the southern states.

That Johnson, in 1865, did not share the views of his later opponents, the northern radicals, is revealed in his connection with the Tennessee constitutional convention of 1864-65. He accepted the work of this body, which in its general outlines

was anything but radical. It provided for submitting two proposed constitutional amendments to popular vote and for compelling the state legislature to repeal the ordinance of secession and to repudiate the Confederate debt. The two amendments were directed against slavery—one for abolition and one for restraining the legislature from ever reviving the outlawed institution. In accepting the work of the convention, Johnson showed himself willing to leave the question of negro suffrage to the state legislature, elected by the oath-taking voters. His methods, when he was war governor, may have been high-handed, and his utterances against the opposition leaders may have been harsh, but the main features of his reconstruction policy in Tennessee were conservative, imposing a minimum demand upon the rights and dignity of the state, and in conformity with President Lincoln's moderate views. His radicalism consisted in pressing the war vigorously and in excluding all but Union supporters from the polling places until a state government could be formed which would enable Tennessee to resume her old place among the other states.

One of Johnson's first public acts of consequence was the issuance of his proclamation stating the charge against Jefferson Davis and other southern leaders for the assassination of President Lincoln, and offering large rewards for their apprehension. This proclamation has since been regarded as a manifestation of Johnson's early animosity toward the South. Yet too much significance should not be attached to Johnson's part in it. In the first place, it was based upon evidence vouched for by the Bureau of Military Justice and urged by both the Judge Advocate General and the Secretary of War. In the second place, it received the sanction of the entire cabinet. Moreover, there was no course open to the chief executive other than to recognize charges which related to one of the most serious crimes with which the nation had ever been confronted. In view of the circumstances it is hard to see what other course the President could have taken, no matter what his own predilections may have been.

Johnson waited about six weeks after his inaugural, April 15, 1865, before revealing the first hints of his policy. During

this time he apparently listened to all shades of advice and even gave advocates of the most opposite policies grounds for hope that he would accept their view of things. Chief Justice Chase and Carl Schurz endeavored to commit him to negro suffrage for the South, and moderates like the Blairs, George W. Childs of the Philadelphia *Public Ledger*, and Samuel N. Barlow of New York urged him to avoid an extreme course. His policy was finally indicated in the amnesty proclamation and in the North Carolina proclamation, both of May 29, 1865. The first revealed no deviation from the ideas which Johnson had held in 1862, when he had expressed his view of the principles which should govern Union officials in the work of reconstruction in Tennessee. He said at that time, ". . . while it may become necessary, in vindicating the violated majesty of the law . . . to punish intelligent and conscious treason in high places, no merely retaliatory or vindictive policy will be adopted. To those especially who in private unofficial capacity have assumed an attitude of hostility to the government, a full and complete amnesty for all past acts and declarations is offered upon the one condition of their again yielding themselves peaceful citizens to the just supremacy of the laws. . . ." The amnesty proclamation of 1865 was entirely consistent with these views. It bore heavily upon the leaders of the Confederacy and ex-acy, to army officers above the rank of colonel, to naval officers above the rank of lieutenant, to governors of seceded states, to voluntary participants in the rebellion whose property was valued at more than \$20,000 and to all who left civil, military, congressional, or diplomatic posts in the service of the United States in order to serve in the Confederate government.

Shortly before issuing the North Carolina proclamation Johnson had discussed the points involved with Carl Schurz. The latter had advised him that the proclamation would be generally construed as opposed to negro suffrage in the South. Schurz pointed out that the ex-Confederates would be willing to take any oath in order to gain their old political privileges. Despite this warning, the President went ahead and issued the proclamation unmodified. After its publication Schurz wrote, June 6th, that it had been commonly interpreted as an evidence

of Johnson's hostility to negro suffrage. The next day one of Johnson's confidential agents, Henry W. Watterson, wrote from Richmond as follows: "With respect to the reconstruction program for North Carolina, the gratification in Virginia is general and extreme. In adopting the suffrage qualification existing immediately antecedent to the secession of that state, great liberality is discovered, and a purpose to refer the matter of negro suffrage to the loyal votes of the state." Before the end of May, Johnson had officially embarked upon a course of non-coercion of the South in respect to the regulation of suffrage rights. His decision must have come considerably earlier.

The mission of Mr. Watterson to the South as Johnson's confidential agent is a revealing episode in the unfolding of the President's policy. Watterson's first letter came from Richmond, dated June 7, 1865. He reported that Virginia had disavowed secession and slavery, had repudiated Jefferson Davis, and had acquiesced in the results of the war. The tone of his letter is that of a subordinate writing what he feels will please his chief. He is "highly gratified at the signs of the times in Old Virginia" which he has found to be that "with but *few, very few*, exceptions, Virginia will return in good faith to her allegiance to the Federal government, and that if a kind and conciliatory course be pursued towards the seceded and rebellious states they will all with good faith and sincerity, resume their membership in the Union of old." From Wilmington he wrote a month later, "I feel that I have pretty thoroughly canvassed North Carolina; and I can say to you in confidence that her future loyalty is as certain as that of any state in the Union. The original secessionists are surely all dead, or have fled to parts unknown. . . ."

The tenor of this correspondence is quite adequate proof of the hue of Johnson's early thought on reconstruction policy. If additional evidence is needed, a passage from one of Watterson's notes from Raleigh is sufficient: "At Richmond, at Newberrie, and at Raleigh, I have reason to know that I have done some service to the Administration by my representations of its head. I have often said in the right quarter that from two positions the Chases and Sumners would never drive the

President: First, that the Southern States are in the Union and have never been out; Second, that the suffrage question belongs to the States alone."

Thus while Johnson's intention remained an enigma to Sumner, Schurz, Chase, and others in the North, it had apparently been revealed to his young confidant, Henry W. Watterson. In June both Schurz and Chase were hopeful of committing Johnson to negro suffrage, and it was not until July that Thaddeus Stevens complained of the drift of Johnson's policy and asked the President to await the advice of Congress before proceeding farther. For three months after the inaugural address Johnson warded off the suspicions of the radicals and kept them hoping that he would eventually accept their views. Even in September so pronounced a Republican as Joseph Medill, hoping to hold Johnson to the radicals, wrote from Chicago, "For God's sake move cautiously and carefully. Don't show so much eagerness to rush into the embrace of the '\$20,000 rebels.' They will suck you like an orange and when done with you throw the peel away. Better stick close to old friends than to exchange them for Copperheads and rebels who will garrate you after using you. The great doctrine of equal rights is bound to prevail. It is your high privilege to head the column."

By October Johnson's policy had been completely unfolded to the public. It was based upon the North Carolina proclamation and included the feature that military rule was to be continued in the South until peace, order, and civil government were established. On October 6th he wrote to James Gordon Bennett that he did not intend to be driven from his purpose "by taunts or jeers, coming whence they may; nor do I intend to be over-awed by pretended or real friends, or bullied by swaggering or presuming enemies. 'If truth is made our guide, the public good our aim' the Union will be restored, attended with all the blessings of a prosperous peace."

The facts of Johnson's policy and his attitude towards the South were given due publicity after October 1865 by reason of the contest between himself and Congress. For his part in this contest he probably deserves criticism for his stubbornness and his uncompromising manner, but for his conduct during

this period he has not been justly accused of inconsistency. The whole of his career, surveyed fifty odd years after the close of his administration, stands out as one characterized by unity of ideas and purposes. There seems to be no basis in fact for the assertions frequently made that he came into office a confirmed radical and under the blandishments of southern leaders deserted his friends and thereby turned a political somersault. The clue to his policy is found in his belief in democracy and in the sturdy nationalism which endured in his emotional fibre because he felt that the federal Union was the defense of democracy in the new world. He assumed for himself the task of restoring the Union which he loved, and he thought that this could be done only through a conciliatory policy. He was destined to fail because he could not command the support of any large section of public opinion. His name was anathema to the South as the result of his part in the war, and he was mistrusted in the North because he was a Southerner. He was a nationalist at a time when sectional passions ran high. In 1861 he put the preservation of the Union above the interests of the South, and in 1865 he put the quiet recovery of the nation above the prejudices and interests of the North. For these two decisions he lost the friendship of both North and South. He left the political scene a bitter and defeated man, but none the less with a record of steady adherence to what he thought was best for the nation.

What Is An Artist?

LEWIS WORTHINGTON SMITH
Drake University

It is often enough asked, "What is art?"; not at all so frequently, "What is an artist?" For the practitioner the abstract question is no doubt the more important. He wants to know what he is doing and to what end. It is he, therefore, usually, who brings the problem forward and sets the discussion going.

For the generality of those who are interested in the arts, however, the concrete question should be the one that most comes home. It is not art as an abstraction that takes possession of our imagination and leads us captive. It is the artist, for whom art is but an instrumentality, who determines in what meadows we shall gather flowers and along what highways we shall follow the elusive, haunting vision of beauty. Not only is it more important for us to inquire about the artist than about art, but also that is probably a thing of deeper moment now than it ever has been before.

Two centuries ago, even one century ago, writers—to confine ourselves to that one of the arts in which the problem is most serious—were largely men of quality, of breeding, of cultivated intelligence. The reign of democracy in the arts and in life had not then established itself. At that time a man could not make a living through the exercise of his literary faculties for the pleasure of the mob. Now untutored recruits like Jack London come up from the bottom, give voice to ideas that belong at the bottom, and make fortunes that would have shocked stout old Samuel Johnson, could he have foreseen them in his day. Because all sorts of men and women presume now to be purveyors of excitants to our aesthetic sensibilities, we must ask ourselves whether all sorts of men and women may be artists. Then, if we are not unmindful of some important phases of the problem, there is another question that cannot well be blinked. If a man is recognized as being an artist at one level of intelligence, in the appeal that his work makes to those of that level, is he to be recognized as an artist by those also of all other levels of intelligence and all other standards of taste?

There is some considerable warrant for the belief, not infrequently expressed, that a work of art must be judged by itself regardless of its maker, that it stands by itself independent of the hand that shaped it. However far that may be just and true, it is not wholly true. A work of art cannot be divorced from the personality of the artist, because it is primarily a product of that personality. The writer of a sonnet is not conveying information. He is not telling or trying to tell the truth about his external world. His purpose is rather to convey to his readers as vividly and as poignantly as he can, within the limits of the form and medium that he has chosen to employ, a feeling for the quality that he himself feels keenly in life, in nature, in some aspect of the universe. It is not the fact that he is reporting. It is something not at all so impersonal as fact. It is his feeling for the wonder or the ugliness or the beauty of so much of the fact as he has discovered or as at that moment engages his attention. If in a way it is the truth about life, it is but a partial truth. Chiefly it is a personality enveloping some portion of life with the warmth of its own emotions.

Art is art, as some one has wisely said, not because it is like nature, but because it is different from nature. Nature furnishes material for the artist to transform, but it is the transformation by which it becomes art. It is through the gift by which he is enabled to bring about that transformation that the artist assumes to be an artist and becomes one. This seems almost obvious, almost inescapable. At the same time it has not been accepted by all those who presume to discuss artistry and its ends. On the face of it, indeed, it is perhaps not in agreement with the current realistic and naturalistic drift, but it is an open question whether realism or naturalism are, either of them, anything at all like the last word.

Recognition of the personal element, that is, the active personal element, the subjective merely taking the objective as its opportunity, acting upon it and refusing to be passive, brings us at once to the judgment that the artist must be a man who keeps step with the modes of thought and feeling of his place and time. The artist of a thousand years ago in the jungles of Africa, satisfying his artistic soul with the glitter of colored

stones embedded in his cheeks or hanging from his ears, could not be an artist to any one actually living in twentieth century America. On the other hand it would be absurd to say that he was not an artist at all. Artistry is not an absolute thing, and the artist is not a specifically determinable being. He is something relative. He expresses or communicates, not scientific values, not romantic or realistic or naturalistic values as such, but human values. Both geographically and historically those values, whether moral or aesthetic or social, are unstable, doubtful, shifting. They are no doubt qualities of the man who entertains them, but they grow out of the soil of his social environment. He is born into them and does little more than give them form and color from what is more intimately his in his own selective individuality. Change is the law of the human scene more surely than it is of the world of nature, and the man who watches the tide of life on Broadway and has the feeling for it proper to a savage from the shores of Lake Tanganyika is too little sensitive to the throb of the universe to be an artist.

The artist is to be studied, then, historically, no less than any other evolutionary being or form, whether man or monkey or machine. At one time a club was perhaps the most fully developed engine on the globe. Milton's "two-handed engine at the door" can hardly have been anything embodying an idea as in his mind differing greatly from the idea of a club. It takes something more than a club to be an engine now. In the same way it takes something more than it took in the days of the club to be an artist now.

In the sweep of the centuries, the progress of the artist has been from a state of naïve emotional response to one of conscious appreciation developing into voluntary expression and becoming finally one of willed communication. That is, the artist was first an open-eyed wonder, after that a joyous or tragic voice, and last a social consciousness sharing his emotions with his fellows. The first two of these aesthetic states are but the germ existences preparing for the other two. Of these latter only the last is the state of the true artist, the creator who shapes, not simply the form or the sound or the word in itself, but who gives it a body and a life in the minds of

others. To cry out with delight in the rapturous presence of beauty, unmindful of whether the cry is or is not heard, is something. The doing of these things or of any other thing of the sort is expression. It is the third stage only in this series of four stages in the development of the artist. It is not communication. To express one's self, in any full measure to liberate the inner passion, is perhaps artistry in its kind, but it has the great defect of being self-centered. It may not go beyond self-revelation, and for that degree of artistry no more is really necessary than an indifference to the eyes and ears of the crowd on the sidewalk. A willingness to parade the public streets in bathing tights, literal or metaphorical, is almost all that is actually required.

If the artist is one who, in his full estate, has passed from the desire to express himself to the desire to communicate something from himself to others, there follows from this critical judgment some further important implications. The shift in the artist's state of mind from that of mere emotional response to that of the communicative prompting is a shift from the passive to the active. That is a thing tremendously significant. The impulse to communicate something is an impulse to bring about something, to affect some one to something. For that reason the communicative prompting is a prompting of strength. It involves a recognition of social relationships, and it presupposes the existence and the prospective expenditure of will. Almost obviously, then, the prompting to expression, when it does not go beyond its own scope and range, is, on the other hand, a prompting of weakness. It is only a blind reaction to what plays upon it. It has within itself almost nothing of the volitional. It takes upon itself the impress of the outer world. To that it yields, and so it becomes the slave of objective reality.

Literature, more than music or painting, is conspicuously an art of communication. The writer is impelled to say something as are other artists, but more than his fellows he wishes to say it to some one, indeed to many. More than that, he wishes the many to be moved by what he says, and he wants them to feel, not for him, but with him. It is interesting to remember, then, that the Anglo-Norman—or the Anglo-Celt,

as you please—has been the world's greatest literary artist, has produced the greatest, most varied, and most finished body of writing so far, and that he has also shown himself the world's most constructive mind. Being a constructive mind that succeeds in realizing its constructive will is being able to triumph over objective reality and impose upon it objective ideality, whether that of the artist or that of the builder of bridges. An artist of the constructive, active, organizing races will not be content with self-expression. His art will be that of communication, of intellectual and emotional influence over his fellows.

If this understanding of the evolutionary development of the artist is the true one, and it seems fairly beyond dispute, there is another question waiting to be answered. What does the artist of the highest class communicate? Is it something subjective, internal, his own emotional world? If it is but the unabashed record of what goes on within himself, he is an artist, if at all, not at the creative level, but at the lower level of subjective expression. Again, if he but transmits the appearances that press upon him from outside, he is also not a creative artist in the fuller sense, because his own personality, his own vision as peculiarly his and no one else's, has no adequate place in the art product. The creative artist of the higher sort is the artist who combines these two functions, the artist who both transmits and transmutes the appearances of the phenomenal world. He sees the phenomenal world, he thrills to it, and then, consciously for others, he restates it in terms of his own emotions, his own response. He is master of his whole world, master of himself and all that surges within him, and master of the welter of things outside himself that would tow him under. It is mastery that at last marks the great artist of the great peoples of the great days.

It is doubtful whether the distinction that sets off the artist of the ultimate sort from the lesser artists who either cry out their own agonies and transports or make transcripts of their external world is not clearer now in practice than it ever has been before. Writers and critics such as Mr. Theodore Dreiser, Mr. H. L. Mencken, and Mr. Sherwood Anderson, in their

writings and theorizings, push realistic naturalism to the point at which the artist is lost in the material that objective reality offers for his art. He gives himself up to it, instead of transmuting it into human and aesthetic values through the play of his own personality. Theoretically at least, therefore, he refuses to accept the communicative prompting. Although his egoism may be as high as any artist's ever was, he does not acknowledge the wish to bring others to his state of mind. His creed does not permit him so much self-assertion as an artist, however much he may compensate himself for the restraint by the tone of his voice as a man.

Equally remote from the creative temper of the true poet is, for instance, such a poet as Sara Teasdale. Writers of her kind are so acutely subjective that it becomes a question now and then whether they know any reality beyond the cobwebby structures of their own brains. They, no more than the artists who bind themselves and the breathings of their spirits to external fact, rise to the full stature of artists such as should address themselves to active and constructive minds. Excessive subjectivity such as marks work like theirs may not fall back from the higher artistry into mere expression, may not become the naïve abandon of a personal cry, but it looks in that direction.

It is the subjective dominating the objective, ideality turning itself into reality, taking possession of reality and shaping it anew, that has been the determining factor, both as revealing and as shaping character, in the spirit of the world's triumphant races. On the other hand, a dreaming passivity has chiefly distinguished the defeated and broken races. On them the futility of existence presses with blind persistence, and their artists report that futility in an unchanging rhythm of depression. At the present hour we can realize that most keenly, perhaps, in the literature of Russia. The Russian artist is full of the woes that attend life in Russia, and his surrender to them is immediately related to the oppressive realism of Russian fiction. Pitched in another key, four sharps, perhaps, in place of the Russian five flats, Irish literature has very much the same note of unavailing passivity. Irish patriotic poetry is amazingly

monotonous, amazingly lacking in any suggestion of constructive possibilities driving the imagination on. At that point Russian literature and Irish literature are in agreement.

There is a poem by an old Scotch poet, William Dunbar, who lived some five hundred years ago, entitled "Lament for the Makers." This title better than anything else, perhaps, preserves for us the old understanding of the poets as makers, because this is a lament for poets. If we no longer think of the artist as a maker, it is because we have gone so far on the realistic and naturalistic road that he has become to us at best no more than a sounding-board for the echoing of the reverberations of externality. That is reducing him a long way from the high estate of a Shakespeare or a Milton, a Thackeray or a Kipling. In fact it is starting him on the path toward elimination. When the artist has become a scientific precisian in reporting upon life he is no longer an artist. He is conditioned so much by his material, is bound so much by his obligation to tell just what he sees as it is, that he loses the artist's thrill.

For the artist who has not so sacrificed the privileges of his own nature, the thrills that he may experience legitimately and legitimately make a part of the experience of others are manifold. Primarily he thrills with the pleasure of pure sensation, color, sound, the whisper of the wind over ruffling water, the dimness of far trees swaying against the pale glory of the moon. Conceptions of ideal beauty may madden him toward their actualization in fact as they did Shelley. Life itself in its totality may be a panorama of wonder for him or a grotesquerie of disillusion passing ever onward into nothingness. Even the art forms themselves in which he works may be a delight, and the fact that words can be turned into a progressive structure, that mere sound can be shaped into organic alternations of passion and repose may have for him an aesthetic charm. Then, in the atmosphere of more poignant circumstance, human possibilities and capabilities, human incertitudes and limitations, may take possession of his romantic imagination or subdue him to the mood that dwells upon the tragic insufficiency of man's passage through life.

In every civilized society there will almost certainly be those who, when they pass into the mood of aesthetic reflection, will some of them think of man in terms of his capabilities and others in the altogether different terms of his limitations. This is most significantly illustrated by a comparison of English literature on the one hand with Russian literature on the other. Browning's *Balaustion's Adventure*, Tennyson's *Ulysses*, and Shelley's *Ode to the West Wind* are all alike very nearly inconceivable as products of the Russian mind. The chaotic inconsequence of most things Russian, Dostoevski's *Crime and Punishment*, Gogol's *Dead Souls*, and *The Inspector General*, even Turgeniev's *Smoke*, the work of a more finished artist, is no less outside the scope and temper of English literary art. The difference between them is that between the artist as a creator, on the one hand, and, on the other, a bundle of tremulous and easily agitated nerves. Diseased minds may find the temperament of the artist in the sensitive excitability of a nervous system whose lack of control leaves it at the mercy of everything external playing upon it. Healthier intelligences will not be so deceived. They will insist that the artist at his best is at once a sensitive physical and emotional organism and a creative mind, that he is not a gelatinous passivity fit chiefly to receive impressions and lost them again in purple to sheets of absorbent paper.

There is another distinction between the artist of the higher sort and his lesser fellow that has not been sufficiently observed. All artists are supposed to be lovers of beauty. In the main the assumption is warranted, but there are two very much opposed ways of loving anything, the creative and the appropriative. The French peasant setting out his vines on some sunny slope by the Loire or the Marne has a love for the grape very different from that of the New York chorus attaché drinking champagne to the clatter of saxophonic jazz in a Broadway palace of pleasure. As a creative force, when he is that, the artist is undeniably a being above the ordinary level of mortals. Perhaps the common feeling that he may be forgiven some shortcomings for which the same tolerance is not accorded to less exalted creatures is somewhat justifiable. In

general, however, it is not the creative artist that asks to have allowance made for his sins, on the score of his aesthetic nature. He wishes to increase beauty in the world, to make more of his fellows love it, possess it, rejoice in it. The artist of the lower sort, the artist to whom such contemnners of American life as Ludwig Lewisohn throw their bouquets of sun-flowers delicately set against the rich green of plaques of luxuriant rhubarb, does not wish to make beauty more and more in the world. It is enough for him if he may gather to himself a considerable portion of the beauty that already is, if he may do as he pleases with it,—use it, waste it, desecrate it, destroy it, and leave its place under the sun a desolation and an abomination to the eyes of men. His art being but the art of the senses, a passion of passivity, it is natural that his life should be the life of the senses. Since he merely takes from the world, instead of giving to it, since he is but a receptivity and not a creative force, his sins are likely to be an expression of himself. In that case surely the consequences that naturally flow from evil-doing to the doors of other mortals should not be kept from him by the erection of misplaced dykes of maudlin sympathy.

What, again, is an artist? Historically and geographically he is anything from a painted savage happy in the glow of color with which he has bedizened himself to a Kipling seeing clearly that,

"East is East and West is West, and never the twain shall meet."

For our time and our place, however, for Anglo-American civilization, British civilization, Canadian civilization, the artist is not a painted savage, not a tremulous reed shaken in the wind, not a mere tremor at the passage of the Destinies, not a wide-eyed passivity waiting on the overtures of nature, not a titillation of the senses thrilling at the discovery of ova in paleozoic mud. For some civilizations, even for some sections of continental European civilization, the artist may be some of these things and need not be more. Now and then he seems to be, perhaps a throat without a brain to match it, perhaps a figure to sway with passion and escape, at the same moment, the knowledge of what passion means, perhaps even a magic of

words that are still as unavailable as a tinkling cymbal trembling through all its sounding brass. For us and for our civilization, however, the artist must be something more than this. Old though the word is, he must "see life steadily and see it whole." He must not shut himself in to the narrow round of his horizon and his passing hour, after the fashion of a hard realism or a fettered naturalism. He must make himself free of yesterday and today and tomorrow. He must thrill with the subjective truth and the objective fact, and he must not be the slave of either. He must delight in the beauty of form and order, but he must not make formal order the law of his art. He must tell the truth about life as he sees it, but he must not be merely the historian of the present and become so the servant of the things that happen in his day and under his eye.

What, again, is an artist? He is a critic of the emotional life of men of his kind for the emotions of men of his kind. He is consequently most deeply a creature of his race and his people. When he ceases to be that, the thing he writes, if the medium of his art is words, is possibly valuable as a human document, but it is not art. No man whose spirit is genuinely the spirit of the Anglo-Normans can think of *The Sorrows of Werther* seriously as a work of art. It is precious only as a memorandum on the subject of the possibilities of human sentimentalism as displayed in Germany. So read and so understood it is interesting, but let no one think of Goethe as an artist because of it, whatever he may be because of *Faust*. It is not artistry for the same reason that, literally or figuratively, the midnight wail of feline woe from the ash-pile in the alley falls short of that distinction.

For one to be an artist it is necessary that he shall have gone through experiences, but there emphasis is important. For the life of our western world in its highest development it is the going through, the belief in going through, that counts. This marks the quality that primarily the Anglo-Normans have developed in the civilization that they have shaped for themselves and that others less able to shape things have come to share with them. The artist who does not see that and feel it, who is in contact with it as a living fact and yet thrills most to the trickle

of slime through his clutching fingers, is not an artist. He might be an artist in some less advanced state of society. The great and overmastering desire of the artist is often that of being known for what he is. One of the surest signs of the possession of aesthetic sensibilities is the evidence of wisdom on the part of the artist in the choice of a residential atmosphere. The artist who is merely a receptive passivity or a vibration in the throat of pain or a reproductive mechanism, whether phonographic or photographic, is not an artist for a civilization at the level of that of the English-speaking peoples. He may be an artist in Russia or Austria, perhaps in Italy or Germany, certainly in many other parts of the world. We may ourselves recognize him as an artist there, while at the same time we insist that for us he would misplace himself here. To be accepted in that character in America he must be an active, constructive, and creative passion. So only can he hope to be at one with the intelligences that he addresses. So only can he hold their respect as an interpreter to them of the meanings of life.

Recently a Russian-American artist, talking about literature and art before a little group of American writers, said that the distinction between continental art and letters and the art and letters of the Anglo-American world lay in the fact that the continental artist wishes to make a confession, and the artist of the English-speaking world does not. That really goes to the heart of the matter. It explains why our young radicals and sentimentalists look upon art as expression rather than as communication. They have not reached the constructive level in art, as they do not understand constructive thinking. Their discussion of American literary art is inadequate, because their own art development has been stopped at a stage just beyond the elementary. They are outside the problem involved, just as a dog baying the moon is outside any real understanding of the state of mind of otherwise comfortable householders trying to go to sleep along the street.

Alexander Sergyeyevich Pushkin

CLARENCE A. MANNING
Columbia University

Alexander Sergyeyevich Pushkin is the poet of Russia. Bursting like a sun from the gloom and pettiness which rested so heavily upon Russian literature at the dawn of the nineteenth century, sailing across the Russian sky to an untimely end, his is the first great name in Russian literature. He is the first to challenge for a place among the great poets of the world and at home he forms the fountainhead of Russian poetic tradition. Nearly a century has passed since his untimely death but even to-day no poetic tradition exists in his native land which is not connected with his name.

On his father's side Pushkin came from a family which was prominent even in the days of Ivan the Terrible. It gave him a consciousness of family pride which was greater than the average and when he came to write the story of Boris Godunov, he did not lose the opportunity of inserting among the list of characters Athanasy Mikhailovich Pushkin. On the other hand a very bizarre incident was reflected in his ancestry. Peter the Great had received as a gift a negro named Hannibal. He educated him, made him a general and then with his usual impetuous manner married him to one of the court ladies. Pushkin celebrated this, too, in his unfinished novel, the *Arab of Peter the Great*.

It was from these strangely different lines that the poet was born in Moscow, May 26, 1799. His early education was entirely French, as was usual among the prominent families of the day. He spoke only French with his parents and teachers and learned Russian from his grandmother and the family servants. As he grew older, he was sent to the fashionable Lycée at Tsarskoye Selo along with other scions of the old nobility, and it was here that his poetic talent began to develop. The boy became a member of the literary circles in the Lycée and a friend of the leading writers of the day, as Karamzin and Zhukovsky. Like many of the young aristocrats of the time,

he dabbled in the revolutionary movements that were paving the way for the Decembrist conspiracy of 1825.

Nevertheless the poems which he composed in school and immediately after, when he entered the Foreign Office in Petersburg, were not at all remarkable. They were largely the familiar Anacreontic praises of wine, woman, and song. Poems to a young lady who used snuff, or to a beautiful actress who could not act, the usual type of risqué verse,—all those conventional conceits which had run through many generations and centuries of the ancient and modern world, flowed easily from Pushkin's pen. Besides these he poured out epigrams and bitter attacks on the soldier-minister of Alexander, Arakcheyev, and the general governmental stupidity.

These slight productions could not exhaust the whole of Pushkin's genius and during these early years he worked on a Russian romance, *Ruslan and Lyudmila*. When this appeared in 1820, its success was instantaneous. Zhukovsky sent him a picture inscribed, "From the conquered teacher to the conquering pupil on the day of the completion of *Ruslan and Lyudmila*." The romance was quite conventional with its tales of magic caps, of wizards and witches, of monsters and of heroes, and yet it was strangely different. The scene was laid in Russia, the superstitions and the weird beings were drawn from Russian sources, and the whole work appealed to the national sentiments of the people. There was something haunting about its verses, something enchanting in the spell which it cast, and on every side came the feeling that now at last a great poet had appeared in Russia, a real poet, a man who could interpret to the nation its feelings and its aspirations.

Pushkin kept up his epigrams and finally not even his influential relatives and friends were able to save him from punishment for his indiscretions. He was transferred to a post in the South of Russia and he was compelled to live at Odessa and further to the East for several years. This gentle exile was not an unmixed evil, for in the South Pushkin became familiar with the poems of Byron and was greatly influenced by them. This does not mean that he slavishly adopted all the mannerisms of the English poet or shared all his beliefs and

teachings, but it does mean that the powerful influence of Byron allowed him to develop and to notice certain phases of life which he had previously failed to emphasize. This stay in the South saw the completion of such poems as the *Prisoner of the Caucasus*, the *Fountain of Bakchisaray*, the *Gypsies* and other poems which show well the fresh and open air of the mountains as well as the passionate encounter of East and West, and the exotic dreams of the East.

From the South Pushkin returned to his father's estates near Pskov and remained there under surveillance for some time. His father was responsible for his good behaviour, and took the obligation so seriously that Pushkin was about to petition for another guardian when he was pardoned by Nicholas I. in 1826.

The last ten years of the poet's life were marked by a steady drift to the right. Russia and her past, the glory of Peter and the Empire, became dearer to him than the tumultuous criticism which he had formerly practiced. He tended toward prose rather than poetry and with the Tsar as his censor he wished to write history. In 1831 he married a Moscow beauty, Natalia Goncharova, and was appointed a Kammerjunker by the Tsar. The pomp of court life wearied him and his manner made many enemies. Finally a scandal arose involving his wife and her brother-in-law, a relative of the Dutch ambassador, Baron George Gekkern Dantes. Puskin challenged him to a duel and was mortally wounded. He died two days later, January 29, 1837.

So much for the outward events of his life. What was the meaning of this surprising shift from rebel to courtier? We cannot know why Pushkin changed his mind; we cannot appreciate all the stages of his development, but we can see in his poems some of those influences which played upon his life. Look at the southern poems written on the fringe of the Russian world, where the forces of West and East meet in mortal combat.

Byronism taught men to idealize the life of the savage. It taught them of the glory of those lands where law and convention are not the sole object of life. There among the wild

peoples, passion and feeling, love and hate, vigor and energy have a deeper and a truer rule. But can the civilized man appreciate them? Here and there; yes! For the greater part, no! Liberty for them means the rule of self and even when it does not, there is something missing. Thus in the *Prisoner of the Caucasus*, the Russian may wonder at and admire the Circassians around him. There is a life, a whirl in their mad riding and raiding and fighting which escapes him. He sits sadly by. The awful majesty of the mountains, the coming of the storms, all rouse and play upon his soul, but they overwhelm him. He does not try to escape. He cannot risk his all upon a mad throw. Even love does not mean for him what it means to the native. A fascinating figure, he wins the love of a chieftain's daughter, but he cannot return it,

Forget me. I do not deserve
Thy love, thy pleasure, no, nor thee.
Waste not thy precious days on me,
For my dead heart thou canst not swerve.
Seek out another firmer youth
Whose love will satisfy thy soul,
Whose passion hath the ray of truth,
Not those chill waves which from me roll . . .
Too late! For pleasures I am dead,
And e'en the ghosts of joy are fled.
Thy friend has passion ceased to feel.
On his dead heart lies time's harsh seal.

Compared with the mountaineers the Russian is a superfluous man. He is forced to escape by the girl but even when she commits suicide at their parting, life has no message for that heart which has gone down to a living death.

The most successful of these exotic poems is the *Fountain of Bakchisaray*, with its clash between East and West, between the Polish girl who has been brought back to the harem by a Tatar raider and the Caucasian who has been reared and trained for the part. They meet in an atmosphere which is redolent of Oriental luxury and mystery, and Zarema begs her rival to turn away the love of the Tatar Girey.

But I was born and reared for love.
You cannot love and feel as I

And why disturb a feeble heart
 With beauty cold that brings a sigh.
 Girey is mine; leave him to me . . .
 But listen; if you force my hand,
 Remember, I can use a dagger.
 I near the Caucasus was born.

Zarema strikes and satisfies her vengeance though she is drowned for her deed and the harem is deserted by its lord and master.

This is the most successful of these poems but Pushkin could not, like Lermontov, appreciate fully the life of the savage. His barbarians, his lovers of liberty, his gypsies, are theorists and gentlemen. Compare the old father's treatment of Aleko, in the *Gypsies*,

Depart from us, O man of pride,
 We are wild folk, without a law;
 We do not torture, do not tear;
 Of blood and groans we wish no more.
 A slayer shall not with us fare.
 You cannot live among the free;
 Yourself alone your eye can see.
 And we will shrink to hear you speak,
 For timid we and good at heart.
 And you are cruel, for power seek.
 Farewell, and now in peace depart.

with the story of gypsy life by Gorky, "Makar Chudra," and you can see at once the character of Pushkin's heroes. They are mild and cultured; they do not have the strong and sturdy, wild and tempestuous feelings of the real barbarians. They do not, like the characters of Lermontov, breathe out the wild and untamable feelings of the mountains and the wilderness.

It was only natural that Pushkin should return to Russia and should fall under the spell of Peter. No other Russian has ever expressed so powerfully the influence of that strange emperor as Pushkin. Poltava is a glorification of the man. The Tsar only appears in the last canto in the account of the battle, but there he appears as the anointed of the Lord, the inspired leader. Before him, at the sound of his mighty voice, the traitor Mazeppa and his Swedish allies flee away. Peter carries everything before him. He is Russia; he is the incarnation of

the spirit of Russia. The poem deals with the love affair of Mazeppa and Maria, the daughter of old Kochubey, but everything leads up to the glory of Peter.

In the same way the last of the great poems, *The Copper Horseman*, is a glorification of the city of Peter.

I love thee, Peter's great creation,
I love thy stern and shapely form;
The Neva wins my admiration,
The granite banks that hold the storm,
The iron fancies on thy walls,
The darkness of thy pensive night,
The moonless gleam that peaceful falls,
When in my room I sit and write
And read without a lamp or light. . . .
O Peter's city, bloom apace
And stand unmoved as Russia stands.
Oh, may the swamps once in this place
Extend propitiated hands.
And let the Finnish waves forget
The rage and fury once they knew
And let peace reign eternal, true,
And Peter's dream let hate ne'er fret.

Pushkin knew the golden age of Petersburg. The great imperial builders had not yet been succeeded by others who could only mar, and Pushkin was the poet of the royal city of the North. What matters it that in the poem we hear of the misfortunes of a poor clerk who suffered in a flood which ravaged the city? Others could treat of the misery of the capital; it was Pushkin's task to sing its glory.

The two greatest works of Pushkin are *Boris Godunov* and *Evgeny Onyegin*. The former deals with the most curious episode of all Russian history, the rise of the False Dimitry. The plot follows closely the account as given by Karamzin in his History. With Dimitry murdered and Fedor dying childless, Boris is forced to take the throne. Is he unwilling? If so, why did Dimitry die? Boris is elected and then a false Dimitry appears with a Polish army. There is no use of fighting against the invader. Defeat makes him stronger and the Tsar's troops will not fight against one whom they consider to be miraculously preserved from death. Boris dies; his son

succeeds him but is almost at once betrayed and commits suicide (?) in prison. That hour strikes the doom of Dimitry. With the Godunov family out of the way, he has no more part to play in the popular imagination.

Boris Godunov is a tragedy but it is free from the unities. It is rather a succession of brilliant scenes, little sketches which allow us to trace the course of events. Some of these pictures are masterpieces; they give us the very spirit of Holy Russia when the land was still isolated from the world. Take the scene in the monastery where the aged Pimen is telling his young friend, the novice Grigory, of the death of Dimitry and the attitude of the tsars toward monastic life.

E'en Tsar Ivan did ever seek repose
In the similitude of monkish toils.
His palace filled with haughty men at arms
He changed to be a monastery real.
His ruffians he dressed in caps and shirts
And caused them all to seem like simple monks.

And then of the murder. As the old man tells the tale of the horrible crime, the novice of the same age as the murdered boy takes over the task of completing the chronicle, but he has the wild thought,—

Boris, Boris! The world falls down before thee,
And no one dares to mention to thy face
The name of that unhappy, murdered youth;
And yet a hermit in his distant celi
Has written out in full thy shameful crime;
But thou shalt not escape from human judgment,
As thou canst not escape the court of God.

Grigory runs away and becomes the murdered boy. As the pretender he falls in love with a Polish girl, Marina: she returns his love as Dimitry but it galls him to think that he must share his throne with a corpse. It is Dimitry and the crown to which she aspires, not the love of a runaway monk. But again when Dimitry pleads his love, it is the disillusioned hero who is begging, and only at the end does he come out with the assertion that he is Dimitry and must and shall remain so. Then he passes on to battle. Boris dies with the responsibility for his guilt. "Thou art so heavy, crown of Monomakh."

If Karamzin awoke the Russians to an understanding of their past, it was Pushkin who made them love it. It is easy to criticize the structure of the drama, to prove that Pushkin was no dramatist, that there are obvious defects in the work, and yet what do they amount to? Here was a production that embodied the national spirit, the national traditions, the national aspirations. Moussorgsky turned it into an opera and the combination of Pushkin's ideas and the music finished the popularizing of the work and to-day *Boris Godunov* is known throughout the entire world. It is the great analysis of the spirit of Russia before Peter.

Boris Godunov is of the past. *Evgeny Onyegin* is of the present. There is nothing unusual about the theme of this novel in verse. A young man bored by the social life of the capital, goes to the country for a change. He meets a country girl who falls violently in love with him. With his urban pride, he talks to her like a prig and leaves her desolate. After some years of travel he returns to Petersburg to find that the little country girl has made a brilliant but loveless marriage and is the belle of society. He tries to renew the old love but he is checked and politely shown the way to the door. It is an old theme, but Pushkin has handled it admirably. There is a slight touch of satire in many places. Thus there is the description of the sister Olga:

Yes, she was modest and submissive,
She always was as gay as morning
And simple as a poet's life,
As sweet as is the kiss of love;
Her eyes were of the heaven's blue,
Her smile, her marble arms and hands,
Her gracious movements, voice and form,—
Yes, all were Olga's. You will find
Her picture everywhere in novels.
It is a pleasant picture too.
I used to love it once myself,
But now it bores me frightfully.
Permit me, readers one and all,
To turn and sketch the older sister.

This is the touch with which Pushkin laughs at society, at the fashionable and popular romantic novel, at everything which

was going on in the great world around him. These little digressions are inserted at the close of many of the romantic scenes to express the poet's reaction to the conventional emotion of the literature of the day. Yet under this veil of cynicism, Pushkin has drawn a woman who stands out as one of the outstanding characters in Russian literature, Tatyana Larina. Her name is rustic and not of the most fashionable (Pushkin smiles at it with his usual urbanity) and yet the irony of the poet never touches her person. She is the young girl, educated on sentimental stories, with her heart yearning for a romantic lover and with a naïveté equalled only by her innocence. Onyegin, the first man from the great world whom she has ever met, captures her imagination. She sees in him a figure from on High. Her letter to him is a masterpiece of simplicity, as she tells him how she loves him. He answers with the typical plea of the butterfly, the same plea which the Russian prisoner in the Caucasus had advanced:

If with the cares of family life
I would surround this life of mine,
If kindly fate had once decreed
To make of me a husband, father,
If with the scene of my own hearth
I might be charmed for but one instant,
Thou art the one I'd seek alone
To have as partner in my home.
Now I will speak and waste no words.
Had I my old ideal achieved,
I would have chosen thee alone
To be the friend of my sad days,
And pledge for what earth gives of good
And been as happy—as I could.
For happiness I was not born
And strange it is unto my soul;
For naught do all thy virtues count;
I am unworthy to possess them.
Believe me (on my word of honor)
Our married life would be a hell.
However much I now may love thee,
That love would cease, when thou wert mine;
And if thou wept—thy piteous tears
Would have no power o'er my heart.
No, they would but enrage it more.

Then judge the horrid kind of life
That Hymen would prepare for us—
Perchance to last for many days!

The cool insolence of Onyegin breaks Tatiana's heart and she is not relieved when her gay suitor commences a violent flirtation with her sister and kills the latter's beloved Lensky in a duel. Olga was inconsolable until she met an uhlan a few days later and eloped with him.

So much for the first meeting. Tatiana goes to the city to visit an aunt and make a successful marriage. When Onyegin returns to the capital, he can scarcely believe his eyes. He seeks an interview with Tatiana but now it is her time to speak frankly and she does:

Onyegin, all this luxury,
The riches here on every side,
My great successes in the world,
My brilliant house and gatherings,—
What do they mean? I would be glad
To give up all this masquerade,
This splendor, triumph and acclaim
For those few books, the unkempt garden,
The humble rustic home I had,
That poor abode where I, Onyegin,
Had first the joy to meet with thee,
Yes, for that poor and humble churchyard
Where now a cross and forest shade
Rest over my beloved nurse.
What happiness I might have had!
It was so near! But yet my fate
Was then decided. Carelessly
Perhaps I took this solemn step.
With many tears and constant prayers
My mother begged me; wretched Tanya
Could never pleasure feel again.
I married. Thou must now, I pray.
Depart from me and stay away.
I know that in thy heart there dwells
Great pride and stubborn honor too.
I love thee (why should I deny it?)
But to another am I sworn
And unto him I shall be true.

Tatiana understands too well that Onyegin loves her now solely because she is prominent and can help him in his ambition to

shine in the world and she understands also that she has no right to injure her husband by leaving him for this will o' the wisp. The thought of sacrificing herself to this miserable creature cannot come into her head and we can hardly treat with respect the outpourings of those liberal and progressive critics who during the last century have attacked Pushkin because Tatiana did not follow her worse impulse and proceed forthwith to have an affair with Onyegin. It merely shows how incapable were many of his successors to appreciate the art and character of the great poet.

In spite of his great success as a poet, Pushkin toward the end of his life sought to distinguish himself in the writing of prose and of history. Perhaps this was due to unfavorable criticism on the part of the court or to the changed manner of his life. At all events he became much interested in the career of Pugachev, the Cossack leader who proclaimed himself Peter III in 1773 and threatened to march on Petersburg to punish Catharine, his guilty wife. He studied all available material on this period and even took a trip to the Orenburg steppes to familiarize himself with the actual situation in the remote southeast.

The results of this historical research were a history of the revolt and a historical novel, *The Captain's Daughter*, which is quite in the style of Scott. There is the conventional plot of a young officer loving a beautiful girl but united with her only at the end of the novel. Before that they are constantly separated by the machinations of the villain Shvabrin, who passes with dexterity, if not with honor, from the service of Russia to that of Pugachev and then back to that of the Empress. Yet the chief character is undoubtedly Pugachev himself. He is a strange character, consciously imposing on his followers as Tsar of Russia, and a curious combination of mercy and cruelty. Now he massacres his prisoners without mercy. Again he pardons some one on some trifling impulse. He is a true barbaric leader and, with his erratic chivalry, the reader is sorry to have him fall into the hands of his enemies. He pardons and treats kindly the hero Grinev, because some time before the young officer in futile kindness gives him a fur coat which is

too small for him. The memory of this act secures all possible rights for Grinev, even though he refuses to take the oath of allegiance to or to serve the usurper. Next to Pugachev the most striking portrait is that of Savelich, the hero's faithful servant. Honest, faithful, willing to die for his master, Savelich is one of a long row of faithful servants who are quite unspoiled by the vices and corruptions of the civilized world. Compare with him Monsieur Beaupres, the French tutor. He had been a barber and then a soldier and now he had come to be a teacher in Russia. What can you expect of such a man? What you receive. He is simply a drunken loafer, inferior in every way to the Russians whom he despises. It must be confessed that Pushkin's style as a prose author is not the equal of that as a poet. Nevertheless though at times a little jerky, *The Captain's Daughter* is a thoroughly readable novel of adventure.

Others of his tales as the *Queen of Spades* are scenes from that Society which Pushkin knew so well. An old countess is sacrificed by a young adventurer Hermann, who hopes to force from her a gambling secret which will make him infallibly victorious. He succeeds but at the last moment the old countess reappears as the Queen of Spades and his end is not an assured social position but a cell in an insane asylum.

We have hurriedly run over some of the most striking of the productions of Pushkin. His importance for Russia is of the greatest. The first of her authors to produce great literature, he created the quiet, smooth-flowing poetic language of which he was the greatest master. He drove out from literature the strained and unreal types and characters which had formerly monopolized it and he put into it the soul and spirit of Russia. There in his works it blooms and flourishes, the spirit of the highest and of the lowest, and he achieves his goal with a lightness of touch which at times blinds us to the deep meaning and permanent value of his work. Later critics, seeing this lightness, might laugh at his ideas; they might scorn his productions, but a truer judgment and time have vindicated Pushkin's art and it was no less an author than Dostoyevsky who seriously and correctly in his Pushkin speech undertook to give the poet the position which he deserved. With all his simple manner,

unaffected and sincere, at times almost childishly plain, Pushkin was an artist and a prophet. More and more the Russians are learning the manifold sides of his great genius and are looking upon him not as the idle singer of an empty day, but as a prophet and a seer, and we may well repeat of Pushkin those lines of his poem, *The Prophet*,

Arise, O prophet, look and see,
And in my power be thou strong,
And passing over land and sea,
Burn all men's hearts with thy clear song.

Book Reviews

JOHN KEATS. By Amy Lowell. Boston and New York: Houghton Mifflin Co., 1925. 2 vols., 631, 662 pp.

Miss Lowell's publishers advertise this book as "a biography of absorbing interest" and "a permanent addition to English literature." Most American reviewers have endorsed these claims with enthusiasm while the English reviewers, Clement Shorter and a few others excepted, have challenged both statements. And so Miss Lowell, so long the center of critical storms that she relished, precipitated in her final work another critical flurry which, according to Mr. Shorter, embittered her last days and hastened her death.

John Keats is not accurately described as "a book of absorbing interest." It is too long, too full of painstaking details as to whether Keats began a week-end trip on one day or the next, and whether or not he took a change of shirts. Too many trivial and insignificant poems are elaborately analyzed. The reader's imagination is too often snubbed by being told precisely how to comprehend John Keats' reaction in certain situations. He feels too often that he misses the wood on account of both trees and underbrush. One instance of elaboration to no purpose is the attempt to trace the source of Keats' imagery in the famous last stanza of the *Ode to a Nightingale*. Miss Lowell gives Professor Lowes' conjectures, which she rejects in favor of her own, covering several pages with unconvincing speculations. She could have settled the matter definitely by quoting a brief note by Professor Walter E. Peck¹ in which practically every striking figure in the stanza is traced to one paragraph in *The Mysteries of Udolpho*.

Undoubtedly the work would have gained in unity and proportion had many of the minute points been disposed of in footnotes and appendices. Here Miss Lowell was handicapped by her intense life-long interest in everything Keatsian. And yet this same passion for Keats is responsible for all that is

¹ *Keats, Shelley and Mrs. Radcliffe*. *Modern Language Notes*, 39:251; April, 1924.

best in the book—the examination of manuscript sources hitherto unexamined, the presentation of nine letters and five poems of Keats hitherto unpublished, along with new Fanny Brawne material that enables Miss Lowell, alone among Keats' biographers, to write satisfactorily of Keats' love affair. Contemporary criticism of Keats and the background of Keats' early life are subjects on which scholars will hereafter refer to Miss Lowell rather than to Sir Sidney Colvin. The excellent index, the appendices, and the illustrations make the book of far more value to the scholar than the ordinary biography of a great writer. Its mediocrity of prose style and lack of proportion raise a doubt as to whether it is really "a permanent addition to English literature," or "the definitive biography of Keats," but there can be no doubt that it is a permanent addition to English scholarship. It will be used extensively by all students of the English romantic poets and will be almost indispensable to the study of Keats. Sir Sidney Colvin's biography remains the standard biography of Keats, but henceforth its authority must be supplemented in numerous details by Miss Lowell. To this very considerable degree at least, Amy Lowell's last work links her name with that of a poet to whom she was long and earnestly devoted.

NEWMAN I. WHITE.

EXPANSIONISTS OF 1812. By Julius W. Pratt. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1925. 309 pp.

According to Dr. Pratt, the War of 1812 was caused not by British interference with American commerce and American sailors, nor by an accumulation of American grievances against England. Instead, the key to the whole story is indicated by the title, "Expansionists of 1812." The declaration of war by the United States was the work of certain frontier leaders, located in both the northern and southern sections of the nation. These frontiersmen were expansionists: those of the North desired Canada while the goal of the southern leaders was the possession of the Floridas and Mexico. A war against England in 1812 was welcomed by both sections as a good opportunity for the acquisition of these regions.

This conclusion is built upon the following premises. First, the Northwest demanded that the British be expelled from Canada, while likewise the South by 1812 felt certain that the Floridas should be a part of the United States. Second, sectional jealousy hindered any separate purchase or acquisition. Third, before the war was declared, "the northern and southern Republicans came to a definite understanding that the acquisition of Canada on the north was to be balanced by the annexation of the Floridas on the south. Thus the war began with a double-barrelled scheme of territorial aggrandizement." Fourth, this program of expansion failed because "the sectional bargain with which the war had begun broke down." A genuine spirit of coöperation by the sections might have secured both Canada and the Floridas. The whole episode resembled the later "Bargain of 1844."

In six chapters the author explains and attempts to prove the statements made in the Introduction. The speeches of congressmen from the frontier and the tone of the western newspapers undoubtedly indicate that by 1812 a loud demand had arisen for the possession of Canada and the Floridas. The difficulty, however, is found in the lack of proof that there existed a bargain between the northern and southern expansionists. It is doubtful if this can ever be definitely shown; certainly in this book the reader is offered circumstantial evidence. Such a statement as, "That some such bargain was actually made *seems* clear from the events during this session of Congress," is not entirely convincing. Also the military defeats in Canada cannot be charged to the failure of the South to keep the bargain, when it is remembered that this war was conducted by a pacifist president, an inefficient secretary of war, generals of Revolutionary War fame, and with New England from the outset hostile to the war.

The author may not convince the reader of certain broad statement and conclusions, yet a doctoral dissertation of this type is an important contribution to the knowledge of the "Manifest Destiny" of our country. Another chapter in the story of American expansion has been written, and in addition much information is furnished concerning the domestic politics

of a disgraceful period in American history. Dr. Pratt proves that long before 1844, in fact beginning with 1783, the American people, especially on the frontier, were expansionists—that they dreamed of a Greater America, in which there would be no fear of the British in Canada or the Spanish to the south and southwest.

PAUL N. GARBER.

THE SOUTHERN PLANTATION. A Study in the Development and the Accuracy of a Tradition. By Francis Pendleton Gaines. New York: The Columbia University Press, 1924.

"When the student finds in a historical publication the assertion that 'The chivalrous, courtly, courageous Southern gentleman of the ante-bellum period was the grandest embodiment of the most superb manhood that ever graced a forum or died upon a battle-field,' he may admire the loyalty represented but he does not feel that light has been thrown upon the subject." This statement reflects adequately Professor Gaines's attitude in treating a subject which readily lends itself to prejudice and on which it is thus difficult to be scholarly. Despite such a disadvantage, however, the book is fair in tone, illuminating; throughout it is readable.

It was right that this subject should have been treated by a Southerner; it is to be hoped that many of his readers will also be Southerners. For them, surely, the book will have a decided value. Professor Gaines's thesis here is, briefly, that the ante-bellum southern plantation (and thus much of southern life) has been unduly glorified, that, indeed, the spectacular plantation of tradition, with its aristocratic planters, its beautiful heroines, its devoted slaves, was seldom matched by such an appearance in actuality. Much in southern life and character has been conventionalized. Probably most Southerners would see at once some truth in this, but whether the whole truth is to be doubted. The fact is, that Southerners (as well as others) are still victimized by the tradition of a glorious society of before the Civil War; they are still under its spell—still suffering and profiting by its existence. In one way this is very fine: it makes for certain qualities and conduct highly commendable; yet as opposed to this, it also makes for much vanity which is

anything but commendable. Professor Gaines's book, then, ought to prove a useful social study, showing how a far-reaching tradition has grown up, and suggesting some of its results.

Needless to say, such a study necessitated much reading of books, newspapers, theatrical records. On the whole, this material is handled ably and well; only rarely does the author appear daunted or confused by the great heaps confronting him. Despite his care, however, he has neglected at least one class of material too significant to be merely glanced at. This is the slave narratives, or autobiographies, those highly partisan and unfair documents which yet reveal so much about the real plantation. More than fifty such narratives appeared in book form alone, yet of these the author takes no more notice than to mention several in his bibliography. He leans rather too heavily, also, on one or two accounts of travelers and visitors in the South—Fanny Kemble and Olmstead, notably—accounts which are undeniably valuable but which must share their importance with a dozen others of the same class. Although perhaps a small matter, too much stress is laid on the feudalistic concept of pre-war plantation society; rather than a "knight of old" the planter was more usually considered as a kind of American Sir Roger de Coverley, a cousin, say, to the landed squire of eighteenth century England, not the knight of feudal times proper. Indeed, Addison's part in formulating the concept of ante-bellum southern society would well bear study; from an early time *The Spectator* was highly prized both in the Carolinas and in Virginia. It is not without significance that Kennedy was imitating Addison in the book, *Swallow Barn*, pointed out as conveniently marking the beginning of the literary tradition. Incidentally, as the author admits, the actual beginning was much earlier. In 1797, for example, Royall Tyler presented in his *Algerine Captive* a gay throng of Southerners, with slaves and a popular and worldly parson, flocking to church on a Sunday, only to issue forth in short order to attend a spectacular horse-race—all suggestive of later days; yet the book, too, is in parts an anti-slavery tract.

Nothing, perhaps, is so much to be regretted about *The Southern Plantation* as that, printed as a doctoral dissertation,

it is unlikely to have the circulation it deserves. Important first of all to students of American social history and American literature, the book yet has high value for the general reader, and if possible should be made easily available.

J. H. NELSON.

The University of Kansas.

PORGY. By Du Bose Heyward. New York: The George H. Doran Company, 1925. 195 pp.

It is not often that a first novel sets a new standard for the *genre* to which it belongs. Yet Mr. Heyward's *Porgy* does just this. By the sole fact that it is a novelette rather than a novel he has just missed writing the distinctive novel of Negro life for which the occasion is ripe. Others have missed it by forcing the material into conventional moulds of humor and pathos, by using the Negro as a megaphone for their own subjective sympathies, or by an attempted shot-gun marriage of propaganda and narrative art. Mr. Heyward, instead of creating characters and situations as mouthpieces of Justice and The Author, has preserved his integrity by the simple expedient of making himself the mouthpiece of his materials. *Porgy* tells the observant reader as much of the Negro's wrongs as if it were a bulletin of the Society for the Advancement of the Colored Race, but it has no tinge of crusading zeal. Because it is a book of singular truth in which truth has its proper ancillary relation to the art of narration, it satisfies its readers on both scores where the ordinary novel of Negro life satisfies on neither. It does a crap game as well as Hugh Wiley and without the suspicion of farce with vitiates the usual account of such diversions among Negroes. The Negro's conception of marriage and of the white man's law, his instinctive ability to obtain forbidden ends by flattering the white man, are here truly illuminated—the more truly because incidentally. If Mr. Heyward's feelings as a poet have led him a step too far in the use he makes of spirituals and of the former grandeur of Catfish Row, they have infused his style with a poetic color and artistic veracity which is rarely found in the ordinary novel. The account of the hurricane is one of the best descriptions of its sort I have ever read; in a medium of prose it achieves some of the effects of both music

and poetry. And the sombre ground-note of the whole story is handled so justly that it leaves ample scope for Porgy's glorious goat, "expressing his contentment in suffocating waves, after the manner of his kind" and yet "'a berry polite goat wut objec' tuh de smell ob de jail-bird'."

NEWMAN I. WHITE.

THE REFORGING OF RUSSIA. By Edwin Ware Hullinger. New York: E. P. Dutton & Company, 1925.

The Reforging of Russia belongs to the handful of worthwhile books about contemporary Russia. The author, Edwin Ware Hullinger, was admitted into the country by the Bolshevik authorities in 1921 as a result of the negotiations carried through by Herbert Hoover, who stipulated, as a condition of American relief for Russia, that American newspaper men should be permitted to enter the country, and should not be prevented from gathering and disseminating information about American activities. The author entered the country as the representative of the United Press. Trained as an observer, speaking Russian fluently, and moving about the country freely for two years, he was able to make an intensive first-hand study of economic, political, and social conditions. The result is the most informing work on Bolshevik Russia that the reviewer has seen.

The work is divided into four parts. In the seventy-six pages of Part I the author discusses the creation of the new Russia which came into existence in 1921, on the ruins of the Russia of the Tsars and the Red Russia of Communism. The exhaustion of the accumulated reserves of the country forced on the Bolshevik authorities the abandonment of Communism and the adoption of what is known as "state capitalism." The setting up of the new social order involved the abandonment of the government policy of furnishing food and lodging, the creation of a monetary and banking system, and the formation of new commercial and industrial organizations.

Part II treats of the forces on which the present government of Russia rests. Russia still obeys the master's whip, but that whip rests in new hands. The communist party now wields the whip in place of the Czar. The handful of communists in

control of Russia are a rigidly disciplined military order. Each of the bare three hundred thousand members of the party undergoes a period of probation lasting a year and also periodical scrutinies. Not even the Jesuits in their prime ever imposed a more rigid discipline. The party is the real government of Russia. The formal soviet machinery of government is largely a piece of decorative framework. The communists' power rests on their own singleness of purpose, the Tcheka, the elaborate organization developed for the purpose of espionage, and the red army. The function of the Tcheka is to purge Russia of all elements actually or potentially dangerous to the existing government. The author found that it functioned far more efficiently than the secret service of the Czars ever did. Eight or nine persons are never assembled in Russia without at least one of them being a stool pigeon of the Tcheka.

Part III describes the various social institutions and departments of life as they are found in present-day Russia. In this section of the work there are chapters on life and home life in the soviet capital; marriage, divorce, and morals; the new courts; paper money, business, and industry; old ills; dry Russia; revolution and religion; and literature, art, and science. The author finds that, in the main, life has been reduced to a grim struggle for physical existence. Both marriage and divorce have been made relatively easy. In the new judicial system the judges are usually former workmen who dispense a summary form of justice. The abandonment of the "dry" policy was for fiscal reasons. In the religious realm the government, though hostile, has merely separated Church and State. Russia's once rich artistic, literary, and intellectual life, is hardly a shadow of its former self.

C. P. HIGBY.

University of North Carolina.

SEVENTY YEARS OF LIFE AND LABOR: An Autobiography. By Samuel Gompers. New York: E. P. Dutton and Company, 1925. 2 vols., xxxiv + 557. 629 pp.

The biography of Samuel Gompers will of course be written; but however skillful the biographer, however great his command of the art of interpretation, his work will not surpass

Mr. Gompers' own version of his career. For every page of these volumes seems to reflect a great personality who had a deep human interest; and that interest elevates to respect and importance many humble persons and many incidents of themselves trivial and insignificant. Samuel Gompers was at heart an artist—circumstance alone made him a labor leader.

Yet with his human interest and his artistic impulse Mr. Gompers had that rare gift so often lacking in humanitarians and artists—a kind of intuition which enabled him to find himself amidst personal adversities and unpromising surroundings. An immigrant, doomed to join the toiling masses in a day when individualism was rapidly entrenching itself in American industry, he naturally had little sympathy for the prevailing economic philosophy. Thus he writes: "The first economic theory that came under my eyes was not calculated to make me think highly of economists. My mind intuitively rejected the iron law of wages, the immutable law of supply and demand, and similar so-called 'natural laws.' As a matter of fact, the laws had no connection with nature or economic forces, nor were they laws but merely theories which sought to justify existing practices.—It was revolting to me that human beings should be used without regard to their needs or their aspirations as individuals. I love men and a sort of passion surges in me when I see them treated unjustly or forced to forego freedom in their own lives." (Vol II, p. I).

Thus he was early in life in revolt against capitalism. How many men, with like convictions, have swung to the other extreme and have become radicals, at least Socialists. But with Socialism and other radical *isms* Gompers also had no sympathy. "According to my experience," he writes, "professional Socialism accompanies instability of judgment or intellectual undependability caused by inability to recognize facts. The conspicuous Socialists have uniformly been men whose minds have been warped by a great failure or who found it absolutely impossible to understand fundamentals necessary to developing practical plans for industrial betterment." (Vol. II., p. 383).

Herein lies the genius of Gompers; rejecting the extremes of capitalistic philosophy and socialism, he intuitively found a

cause, practical and definite in its nature, to which he could anchor his efforts; it was trade unionism, and to what extent the stability and influence of the American trade union movement today are due to Samuel Gompers, can never be estimated. And this man with no sympathy with the established order or with radical revolt, was a Jew and a foreigner—facts well worth our meditation in this hour of nationalistic prejudice against the alien.

Mr. Gompers' volumes are perhaps too full of details. He met men of all ranks and conditions; laborers, capitalists, agitators, judges, Congressmen, and Presidents—the great and the lowly of this country and of Europe—and of each of this vast number it seems he has something to say. But giving coherence and unity to the undue multiplicity of details is the human interest of the narrator; Gompers was a master spirit and his volumes will be a *vademecum* in the literature of the American labor movement.

W. K. B.

THE HISTORY OF AMERICAN IDEALISM. By Gustavus Myers. New York: Boni and Liveright, 1925. 349 pp.

SOUTHERN PIONEERS IN SOCIAL INTERPRETATION. Edited by Howard W. Odum, Chapel Hill (N. C.): The University of North Carolina Press, 1925. vi, 221 pp.

These volumes deserve joint consideration because they reflect a body of liberal opinion regarding the nation at large and a section of the nation. Mr. Myers, well known for his somewhat "unpatriotic" history of the Supreme Court and his drab and realistic portrayal of corruption in his story of Tammany Hall, when he views the American spirit from its earliest days to the present, becomes an optimist. He finds the United States to be a land of idealists; indeed, "the facts reveal much more than even the most ardent American believers in national idealism have thought. They show that from the very start that American idealism has demonstrated itself in a consecutive series of achievements, all fraught with far reaching and salutary consequences to America itself and to the human race in general." This series of achievements furnishes the subject matter for twenty-one chapters, ranging in theme from the establishment of religious liberty to the curbing of plutocracy. It is safe to say that in no one volume can such an

amount and variety of stimulating information regarding the better aspects of American life be found. Of particular value is the discussion of movements in the history of the fine arts and the efforts toward moral reform, (Chs. XI-XIV, XVII). And the explanation of this national idealism is not attributed to individuals or groups of individuals, but to the power of the people. For the people to make a vital decision requires a long time; but once made, that decision stands. On the closing page we find these lines: "There have been in the annals of history occasional appearances of great religious, moral and idealistic leaders. But where in all history is to be found the precedent of a people idealistic and to such a preponderant degree that the nominal leaders simply expressed what the people themselves felt and thought? As an idealistic nation America has proved that, after all, history is still in an incipient stage."

Thus a socialist proves to be an optimist. Not so hopeful, however, is a sociologist who lives and works in the Southland of today. Professor Odum, in his introductory essay entitled "A Southern Promise," finds a very narrow margin of promise in the southern scene. "The South," he says, "has lacked an atmosphere conducive to achievement and distinction. . . . What we mean in this statement is that there has been no suitable social, cultural, and spiritual atmosphere in which leadership could develop or distinction survive. . . . For years now the note has been a negative one and the South has been sensitive and against the things that are progressive and the things that are not her own." Why, then, this collection of essays consisting of interpretations of eight southerners and of one who was not of the South but did much for southern agriculture? It is to show that in the realm of personality the South has a rich endowment, and the southern promise of today is that out of this realm of the spirit there may come in the future national leadership in things of the mind and the spirit.

The group of personalities examined and interpreted includes Woodrow Wilson, Walter H. Page, Charles B. Aycock, Seaman A. Knapp, Augustus B. Longstreet, Joel Chandler Harris, Booker Washington, Madeline Breckenridge, and

Edward K. Graham. To each an essay well worthy of the subject is dedicated. But the reader must ponder if Woodrow Wilson, the internationalist, was a southerner except by accident of birth, or if there was anything of promise in Longstreet, the arch sectionalist? Certainly Walter Page was by conviction a nationalist; he might as well have been born in some other section. But these quibbles aside, there is one thing lacking in the volume, and that is an analysis of conditions that stimulated these leaders to action, the audience they had, the real nature of their influence. Herein lies the need of sociological, economic and historical inquiry, viz., an examination of the social and economic institutions of the South in the past and the present; only after such an examination can we thoroughly understand the perplexing questions of public opinion and leadership.

W. K. B.

THE PASSING OF POLITICS. By W. K. Wallace. New York: The Macmillan Company, 1924. 328 pp.

Mr. Wallace stated the theme of this volume in the concluding sentence of *The Trend of History* (The Macmillan Company, 1922). "The State is the shell, it is no loner the kernel, of social life." Having traced in modern history, by carefully selecting his evidence it must be said, the rise and the first evidences of the decline of politics, it was anticipated that the author would devote a second volume to a close study of the present situation in order to demonstrate the change which he believes is taking place. What he has done, however, is to discuss, with greater reliance this time, upon the philosophical than upon the historical method, the theory and practice of politics, and various aspects of domestic and foreign politics. In three concluding chapters evidence is suggested rather than definitely assembled that economic interests are displacing politics. The author believes that political society is making way "for a cosmopolitan (industrial) society with (a) peace as its focus; (b) Caesarism as its rule; (c) science as its cohesive force; (d) engineers and technical experts as its spiritual ministrants."

Stimulating as this study is, it has serious defects. It is not well organized, and the reader's patience is taxed with fre-

quent repetition. The student of history will question the originality of his interpretation of the Renaissance, and will find it difficult to accept his assertion that France favored the formation of the Triple Alliance as a means of gaining the support of Russia and England. Statements which require more evidence than has been given are frequently made. "Liberalism is at best a futile doctrine, a sort of social anæsthetic." "It must be admitted with all frankness that the middle class has in the new order no economic and less social value." "Political liberty and equality are looked upon as of no value as compared with economic liberty, or social equality." These assertions are based upon the assumption that a new order is beginning in which national boundaries are being superseded by demarcation lines between capital and labor, that political liberty is obsolete in an age which places the highest value upon economic coöperation. Hence, from the author's point of view, all efforts to prolong the duration of the "age of politics" by liberal reforms, or even by the State's adoption of socialism are obstructions to be swept aside. This is interesting as speculation, and there is reason to believe, as in recent events in Germany and Italy, that the traditional State will in time be modified to meet the requirements of an increasingly industrialized society. It is, however, far from adequate as a well rounded interpretation of the present situation.

E. MALCOLM CARROLL.

THE BOOK OF AMERICAN NEGRO SPIRITUALS. Edited with an introduction, by James Weldon Johnson. Musical arrangements by J. Rosamond Johnson. Additional numbers by Lawrence Brown. New York: The Viking Press, 1925. 187 pp.

ON THE TRIAL OF NEGRO FOLK-SONGS. By Dorothy Scarborough, assisted by Ola Lee Gullledge. Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1925. 289 pp.

Not even in the early 1870's, when the Fisk Jubilee Singers were winning admiration in America and Europe, was the popularity of the Negro spiritual as great as it is to-day. The decade following Emancipation saw almost as many printed collections as the present period, but it did not see the Negro song attracting much serious interest except from the folk-singers themselves. Nowadays the Negro song receives much

more attention in the white man's world of music and from students of folk-lore and of sociology. Negroes who have progressed beyond the folk-group are for the first time fully aware of the value of their heritage and have forsaken the indifference and even antipathy with which many of them formerly regarded the spiritual.

The Book of American Negro Spirituals is admirably designed to satisfy this popular interest. It contains sixty-one songs, well selected from the hundreds that have appeared in print. The musical rendering is better than that in most collections, though perhaps not quite so accurate as the excellent work of Natalie Curtis Burlin. Mr. Johnson's fifty-page *Preface* is an excellent introduction to a work of this sort. His discussions of Negro dialect, the Negro sense of rhythm, and the conditions under which the songs are sung will aid materially in a proper understanding of the songs, even though he does claim a little too much for them as poetry. In his belief that the spirituals may originate either communally or from one particular singer he is probably right. He might have reinforced his own very convincing experience with Negro bards like "Singing" Johnson with citations of very credible examples of both types of origin given by several previous writers on the subject. (These writers were of course unfortunately ignorant that Mr. Mencken, in reviewing the present volume, was to abolish the communal origin theory). In his claim that the Negro spiritual owes nothing to the religious songs of the white race Mr. Johnson is betrayed by his racial zeal and by H. E. Krehbiel's *Afro-American Folk-Songs*. Practically every writer on this subject since Krehbiel's volume appeared has asserted that the spiritual is purely Negro in origin. Yet Professor Louise Pound some time ago traced the origin of one of these spirituals to an old Methodist song, and there are at least two other students of the subject who have the material to show a close relation between the Negro spiritual and the early religious songs of Methodists, Baptists, and Millerites. Rightly understood, this will in no way impair the value of the spiritual or its essential racial qualities, of which the Negro race is so justly proud. And yet the Negro imagination has been so

insistently criticized as merely imitative and so sensitively defended as purely original that such a simple rectification as this will probably be ascribed to racial prejudice.

Miss Scarborough's book has none of Mr. Johnson's protective race-sensitiveness; it may have, from a Negro point of view, a touch of the insensitiveness so apt to characterize the writings of an Anglo-Saxon about another race. Its dominant note, however, is that of the enthusiastic amateur. Strictly speaking, it is not a song collection at all, although it contains a great many songs, with the music. The emphasis, however, is not upon the products of the hunt so much as upon its experiences. The song becomes more a trophy than an object of intrinsic value; the snark—almost—turns out to be a bojum. Still, the songs are there, for any pedant whose interest is less joyous than Miss Scarborough's. And since he must find them without the aid of an index, he even becomes a party to the hunt somewhat after the manner of Commodore Trunnion. The copious and sprightly comments telling how, why, and when each song was secured furnish interesting settings not found in any mere collection. They have considerable interpretive value and incidentally demonstrate for the Negro song a surprising prevasiveness and a surprising amount of affection on the part of hundreds of white people (not to mention the Negroes themselves) with whom Miss Scarborough has talked or corresponded.

Eight types of songs are treated in separate chapters: Negro Ballads, Dance Songs, Children's Game Songs, Lullabies, Songs about Animals, Work-Songs, Railroad Songs, and Blues. The second chapter is a valuable demonstration of the Negro's part in transmitting English popular ballads. Religious songs receive only casual attention in the introductory chapter and, a little inappropriately, in the chapter on Railroad Songs. It was not a part of Miss Scarborough's task to relate her songs thoroughly to all that had previously been published on the subject, but she does make good use of the articles in the *Journal of American Folk-Lore* and of illuminating comments by Professor Kittredge.

NEWMAN I. WHITE.

MAN: HIS MAKING AND UNMAKING. By E. Boyd Barrett. New York: Thomas Seltzer, 1925. IX, 269 pp.

Those much bandied and little understood phrases, "Psycho-Analysis," "Freudian Psychology," and the like, not proving sufficiently descriptive, Dr. Barrett has given us a new and ever more mysterious one—"Humanology." There is more originality in the term, however, than in its connotation. *Man—His Making and Unmaking* proves, upon perusal, to be a popular presentation of the new psychology of the Unconscious, and might very well have been given one of the more traditional titles, although its author explains with ease that it is a study, not of psychology, but of "humanology."

What, however, is in a name? There is, no doubt, room and reason for just such a popular presentation of this much discussed subject. It were well, too, that the Unconscious be introduced to the public under decent and decorous circumstances, well calculated to discourage morbid curiosity at the same time that it supplies real information. Dr. Barrett does give some real, if rather general information, and he certainly gives it in a healthy manner. He has achieved fair success in what seems his major purpose, that of supplying the "plain man" with a sort of elementary and expurgated edition of the new psychology.

There seems, however, to be a second purpose running through his volume—a desire to reconcile his science with religion. It is obvious, also, that to the author, a former teacher at Georgetown University, religion means Roman Catholic Christianity. There is something delightfully complacent, indeed, in the way in which all other religions are left to make their peace with "humanology" as best they may. Dr. Barrett realizes the probability of a renewed conflict between religion and science—this time with psychological science—and he wishes to see this conflict avoided. Now the discovery that perverse human acts have their origin, in many cases, in the Unconscious—that is, are pre-determined by the persistence of past influences in this lower mental level—would seem to deny the existence of any free choice in the commitment of these acts. The implications of this denial for the conceptions of responsibility and sin, so fundamental to Christian ethics, are

and always have been obvious enough. Dr. Barrett admits, and declares the Church admits, that certain psychological conditions do inevitably limit the individual's "freedom" and responsibility; but he denies, with the Church, that any such conditions can remove *all* responsibility.

The negative case, viz; that responsibility is necessarily limited at times, is convincing enough,—it is, indeed, implied in the premises. The positive case, that "freedom" does exist despite such partial limitations, is, unfortunately, not demonstrated—it is merely declared. Faced with the apparent implications of his whole chain of reasoning, the author takes refuge in a purely dogmatic assertion of the fundamental freedom of the will (p. 146).

Worse than this, he has at times resource to a sort of technical mysticism, as in the chapter on "Vital Energy," which might have gone well with a treatise on physiology of the vintage of 1825, but seems bizarre enough in a discussion of the very latest scientific sensation. It may well be that mysticism deserves respect and has its place—but that place is hardly in a supposedly strictly scientific study. The confusion of the two gives us, not science, but a sort of pseudo-science—the more misleading for the fact that it has the appearance of the real thing. There has already been too much of this sort of performance—a surfeit of pseudo-medicine, of pseudo-anthropology, and the like. We are now, it appears, to be presented with a pseudo-psychology. This criticism, however, is not intended to deny the merit already credited to the book; viz, that there is within its pages much general and presumably reliable information which should assist in orientating the layman in this new field.

R. H. SHRYOCK.

Some day before you get too old to travel, lay aside the care of your property and investments. Enjoy travel and devote more time to other interests. A living trust agreement with the Fidelity Bank will give you time to do these things. Let's talk it over.



The Fidelity Bank

DURHAM AND WEST DUPHAM

